### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

+ + + + +

### COPYRIGHT OFFICE

+ + + + +

## COPYRIGHT ARBITRATION ROYALTY PANEL

+ + + + +

In the matter of:

| Docket No. | 2000-9

Digital Performance Right in Sound Recording and Ephemeral Recording

| CARP DTRA | 1 & 2

Conference Room 216 Second Floor Offices of Arnold & Porter 555 12th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

Monday, October 22, 2001

The above-entitled matter came on for rebuttal hearing, pursuant to notice, at 9:00 a.m.

#### **BEFORE**

THE HONORABLE ERIC E. VAN LOON Chairman
THE HONORABLE JEFFREY S. GULIN Arbitrator
THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. von KANN Arbitrator

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

### **APPEARANCES:**

On Behalf of Clear Channel Communications, Inc., National Religious Broadcasters Music License Committee, and Salem Communications Corporation

BRUCE G. JOSEPH, ESQ.
THOMAS W. KIRBY, ESQ.
DINEEN PASHOUKOS WASYLIK, ESQ.
of: Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 719-4913
(202) 719-7000

KARYN ABLIN, ESQ.

# On <u>Behalf of American Federation of Television</u> and <u>Radio Artists</u>

ARTHUR J. LEVINE, ESQ.

of: Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3315
(202) 408-4032

# On Behalf of the Association for Independent Music

BARRY I. SLOTNIK, ESQ.

of: Loeb & Loeb, LLP

345 Park Avenue

New York, New York 10154-0037

(212) 407-4900

JACQUES M. RIMOKH, ESQ.

### APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

On Behalf of BET.com; CBS Broadcasting, Inc.; Comedy Central; Coollink Broadcast Network; Echo Networks, Inc.; Everstream, Inc.; Incanta, Inc.; Launch Media, Inc.; Listen.com; Live365.com; MTVi Group, LLC; MusicMatch, Inc.; MyPlay, Inc.; NetRadio Corporation; Radioactive Media Partners, Inc.; RadioWave.com, Inc.; Entercom Communications Corporation; Spinner Networks, Inc.; Susquehanna Radio Corp.; Univision Online; Westwind Media.com, Inc.; and Xact Radio Network, LLC

ADAM I. COHEN, ESQ.
MARK A. JACOBY, ESQ.
R. BRUCE RICH, ESQ.
FIONA SCHAEFFER, ESQ.
KENNETH L. STEINTHAL, ESQ.

of: Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP 767 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10153 (212) 310-8622

On Behalf of AEI Music Network; DMX Music, Inc. SANDRA M. AISTARS, ESQ.
DAVID R. BERZ, ESQ.

of: Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP 1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 682-7272

On Behalf of the Recording Industry Association of America, Inc.

JOHN A. FREEDMAN, ESQ.
ROBERT ALAN GARRETT, ESQ.
HADRIAN R. KATZ, ESQ.
BRAD R. NEWBERG, ESQ.
RONALD A. SCHECHTER, ESQ.
JULE L. SIGALL, ESQ.
CHRISTOPHER WINTERS, ESQ.
MICHELE J. WOODS, ESQ.

of: Arnold & Porter
555 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 942-5719

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

## APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

On Behalf of Public Radio:

DENISE LEARY, ESQ.

of: Public Radio, Inc.

635 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

(202) 513-2049

On Behalf of American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada:

PATRICIA POLACH, ESQ.

of: Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.C.

805 15th Street, N.W.

Suite 1000

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 842-2600

12756

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

<u>WITNESS</u> <u>DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS</u>

James McDermott

By Mr. Newberg 12890

12904

 By Mr. Steinthal
 12765
 12896

 By Mr. Kirby
 12856
 12901

Wolfgang Spegg

By the Panel on page 12906

Scott Purcell

By the Panel on page 13032

John Heilbronn

By the Panel on page 13096

<u>EXHIBIT</u> <u>DESCRIPTION</u> <u>MARK</u> <u>RECD</u>

### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:06 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Well, good morning everyone. Great to see you. Hope you had a chance to enjoy yesterday off, and I know at least part of the room is extremely pleased at the way things worked out late last night.

So the Panel is extremely relieved and delighted to have it confirmed, once again, that the fire power on that side of the table exceeds the fire power on this side of the table, and that you all thought ahead to advise our licensee witnesses for this afternoon that they should not go to the Library of Congress but should, instead, come here. And we are deeply grateful for you having thought of that and figured out a way to reach them.

We don't know -- haven't been able to reach Gina -- whether she had thought of the same thing. But, thankfully, that was done. And I suppose we -- has anyone, as far as we know, reached Mr. Hackett for tomorrow or Junkayla (phonetic) or Junkala?

We will. 1 MR. GARRETT: 2 CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: You're able to do Wonderful. 3 Thank you very much. Are there any other administrative or 4 5 procedural things for us? MR. STEINTHAL: 6 I would say this on sort 7 of a good news/bad news front. I noticed actually 8 this morning on the schedule of the witnesses that all 9 of the licensees were scheduled for this afternoon. The good news is this is going to be very short. 10 11 bad news is, had I noticed that sooner, I could have 12 saved Mr. McDermott coming down last night, and we 13 could have done this at 12:30 or something, you know, before the licensees come in. 14 15 But as you know -- and I have gotten 16 better at my estimates. My estimate on Mr. McDermott 17 was probably a half an hour tops, half an hour to 45 18 minutes tops. And I'm more confident of that than I was even before. 19 So we're going to end up with a 20 rather long hiatus this morning. 21 So the good news is it will be brief. bad news is that the way that witnesses lay out, had 22

1	I noticed that previously, we might have been able to
2	move things around a little bit.
3	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Well, I think that we
4	are all feeling a bit more relieved about the
5	schedule. What had looked like near mission
6	impossible or a death march looks like something that
7	we're going to knock on wood be able to handle
8	within the days available.
9	Mr. McDermott, good morning.
10	MR. McDERMOTT: Morning.
11	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Welcome.
12	MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: We are very
14	appreciative of your coming down, and hopefully you
15	had an enjoyable time coming last night, so it's not
16	an incredible hardship to not show up later this
17	morning.
18	MR. McDERMOTT: Had some great Italian.
19	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Excellent. Excellent.
20	MR. McDERMOTT: I'm proud to be part of
21	the process. Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Well, we're pleased to

1	have you. Let me ask you, please, to raise your right
2	hand to be sworn in by our Court Reporter.
3	WHEREUPON,
4	JAMES McDERMOTT
5	was called as a witness and, having been first duly
6	sworn, assumed the witness stand, was examined and
7	testified as follows:
8	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Can I ask just one
9	question on scheduling? In view of what Mr. Steinthal
10	has just said, would it make any sense, and is it
11	possible, to start the afternoon session, say, at 1:00
12	instead of 1:30? Is there any way to reach Mr. Spegg
13	and move us up slightly? I don't know whether that's
14	feasible or not. If it isn't, you know, no big deal,
15	but
16	MR. STEINTHAL: That's fine with me. If
17	I don't have any communication with him, so
18	MR. GARRETT: We had contact with him. I
19	don't know whether we can reach him this morning or
20	not, but we can certainly try and see what happens.
21	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Okay.
22	ARBITRATOR GULIN: I would say more like

1	11:00.
2	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Well, I don't know if
3	we should get him that early.
4	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Can you get in touch
5	with him? He's in town? He's ready to come?
6	Especially as soon as possible. We're going to be
7	finished with this witness very shortly.
8	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: We'll certainly be
9	here, and if it's possible, if we figure out a way
10	I'm trying to remember, though. Isn't he from the
11	West Coast?
12	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: He's here. He's in
13	town.
14	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: I know. But if you
15	don't know where he is, and you've got to call his
16	office to find out, and it's 6:00 a.m. in his
17	
	office
18	office MR. STEINTHAL: Spegg is from Toronto,
18	
	MR. STEINTHAL: Spegg is from Toronto,
19	MR. STEINTHAL: Spegg is from Toronto,

1	isn't he now? Some days or
2	MR. STEINTHAL: We'll find out later,
3	won't we?
4	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Okay. Mr. McDermott,
5	we all appreciate the effort that you put into putting
6	together your written statement, which we've had a
7	chance to review. And it's so clear that I don't
8	think we even need to have your counsel ask much by
9	the way of direct. But do you have
1.0	MR. STEINTHAL: In the exercise of
1.1	reminding the Panel of who we're dealing with here, I
12	was going to ask Mr. McDermott if he wanted to spend
13	a couple of minutes describing his background, what
14	his current position is, and then get into the cross
15	examination questions. But I think it would be
16	helpful for context reasons for Mr. McDermott to give
17	that bit of background, and then we can go right into
18	the cross.
19	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Good. Okay.
20	THE WITNESS: I've been in the record
21	business in various positions since 1984, started out
22	working as a clerk in a record store on Long Island

and kind of worked up through the retail world until

I started working for Warner/Elektra/Atlantic

Distributors in 1987, doing local marketing.

Did that for about a year and a half and then went to Polygram to do alternative marketing in the New York market for -- for about a year, and then I went to Island Records in 1990 and was the National Director of Alternative Marketing for Island, mostly working on emerging artists, artists that didn't have a real good chance to get played on radio or had a real good chance in retail.

That's kind of been a theme throughout my career, I guess, is getting new things started under difficult circumstances.

Kept with the marketing, mostly on the retail side, until about 1994 when I started to get involved with the RIAA Multimedia Executive Committee with Polygram, which was working primarily at that time on the introduction of the enhanced CD format, which back then was called CD Plus for about five minutes, which was a -- which was supposed to be a new product that included -- it was a CD with multimedia

functionality that we thought was going to be the -the next great thing. And it ended up being the next
okay thing.

And then, in 1995, Polygram, because of -as a result of my experience working with that, put me
in charge of new media in the United States, and I
became VP of New Media in 1995, in March I think it
was. And was with Polygram until they were acquired
by Universal in -- I guess I left there in July 1999,
and then I went to Sony. I've been working with Sony
since July 1999.

Throughout my tenure at Polygram I worked on online internet marketing, development of policies, and business strategy, both in the United States and, actually, it evolved into a global role because the U.S. was the leader in the new media field.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: You used the term a couple of times "alternative marketing," which, as far as I can recall, has not been used in this arbitration before. If it has, I forget. What is -- in the context of the record industry, what is "alternative marketing"?

1	THE WITNESS: Finding different channels
2	to get music to people, to expose it to them and to
3	enable them to buy it.
4	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: And what kind of
5	channels might those be?
6	THE WITNESS: Well, in the old world, it
7	was something as simple as maybe doing a non-
8	conventional television campaign, working with
9	maybe setting up campaigns with National Public Radio,
10	putting an artist on the back of a truck or in a van
11	and getting them to show up and play in parking lots,
12	so that if they weren't being played on the radio
13	people had a way of hearing their music.
14	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Is this something
15	that most record companies do in one way or another?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And, actually,
17	the web has provided new ways of doing that.
18	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Okay.
19	CROSS EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
21	Q When you say "the web has provided new
22	ways of doing that," what do you mean?
- 1	

1	A New methods of exposing different types of
2	music to people. It's a new medium, new channel, so
3	new ways of doing things.
4	Q And you mentioned that a theme throughout
5	your career has been emerging artists. Can you
6	explain a little bit more what you mean by that?
7	A Artists that typically are traditional
8	windows to the public, are very selective. They are
9	very effective filters of taste for consumers. And
10	part of our job is promoting to those filters, so that
11	then ultimately music can get through them to
12	consumers via those different windows.
13	Q Could you give a little bit more of an
14	example what you mean by "those windows to the
15	public"?
16	A As it relates to just generally promoting
17	an artist?
18	Q Yes.
19	A Working a record to radio, calling up a
20	retailer and making sure that they have the record in
21	stock and that potentially they're playing it in the
22	store, or that they've got the record in the front of
1	1

the store, or they've put a poster up, giving out 1 fliers at college campuses, everything from -- you 2 3 know, there's different types of marketing, obviously, for different levels of artists. 4 But when you're first starting an artist 5 and they've got very little exposure, you've got to 6 7 think of all sorts of creative ways to get 8 ultimately to get them to that stage where every time 9 you turn on the radio there's millions of people 10 listening to it. In the context of your being involved in 11 12 emerging artists, I take it you've become aware, over 13 the course of the last 10 years in particular, about 14 how much more limited broadcast radio play lists have 15 Is that right? become. 16 Α Yes. Has it been sort of a steady refrain from 17 0 18 the major labels in the last decade or so that it's become harder to launch new artists on broadcast radio 19 because so many of the -- the play lists have become 20 21 more contracted? 22 Α There has been a lot of consolidation in

1	not only in radio but also in the retail space.
2	And as a result, because we, at the same time, over
3	the past decade have put out started putting out a
4	lot more records. There is less places for our music
5	to get out, certainly.
6	Q And what have you done to overcome the
7	constricted sort of broadcast promotional opportunity
8	in terms of the width of the play list to try to
9	promote new artists?
10	A A multitude of things. It would be
11	difficult to answer the question and tie it up with a
12	neat little bow, because it depends on the music. If
13	it's an artist who is a bluegrass artist, we might
14	send them to county fairs with cassette samplers to
15	give out to people in the audience and have them play
16	almost for for no money and develop a buzz from a
17	very grass-roots kind of a level.
18	I think promotion is all about timing.
19	It's about understanding that at a certain point in an
20	artist's career it will be time to take them to those
21	windows with your case as to why those those

should pay attention to that artist and

windows

1	further expose them.
2	Q And when you were talking earlier in
3	response to Judge von Kann's question about what fell
4	within the alternative media area, the alternative
5	media being principally the areas to which you would
6	seek resort to promote before people
7	A Right.
8	Q broadcast radio, correct?
9	A If you're talking about mainstream, large-
10	scale, commercial radio in major markets, yes. There
11	are plenty of radio stations, like college radio
12	stations, that we spend spend a tremendous amount
13	of time trying to get those stations which have
14	different criteria for playing music to pay attention
15	to artists as well.
16	It's all about taking the right artist at
17	the right time to the right outlets. There's a
18	tremendous amount of thought that's put into it, as I
19	refer to in my testimony.
20	Q Is it a correct statement that, you know,
21	15, 20 years ago it was more common that in smaller
22	markets, before the consolidation of the broadcast

radio business, in smaller markets there might be radio stations that the labels would use as sort of test beds for new artists, and then try to spring them in more major market radio stations later?

A That is something that didn't only happen 15 years ago. I think that's happened throughout the history of the record business. It continues. It's not limited to just radio promotion. If a track has, let's say, a Latin kind of a feel, we'll look at markets that we know traditionally do really well in that kind of music and try to get visibility for a record and see if we can start a spark at the clubs, radio stations, retailers, and on the street.

As a matter of fact, we have street teams, particularly in some urban areas, that market records to barber shops. They'll actually go into -- because those end up being kind of social hubs, where people sit around and talk about music and things. So we'll get -- we have people that go out and put posters up in barber shops and hand out cassette singles and CD singles to try to get a buzz started there.

Q It's fair to say --

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: You said a little bit earlier that there was a narrowing, both on radio and in retail space. It sort of ties in, in my mind, with barber shops. Are there fewer record stores now than there used to be, or is it -- because it seems to me that there are more and bigger. But is it perhaps that they just use up more of the bins for shelf space on major artists, or what did you mean by the narrowing of the retail space?

THE WITNESS: There used to be a lot more diversity in the types of retail stores. One of the things that -- one of the kinds of stores I've worked with throughout my entire career is the mom and pop store where you go into a record store and the people behind the counter recognize you and know what your individual tastes are from visiting that store over a period of time.

And so they'll say, "I've got this great new record in from, you know, an import from the U.K. yesterday, and I think you'll really enjoy it." That process, because of the way that the retail space has changed, isn't as prevalent as it used to be.

You know, as you mentioned, there are big 1 stores that have a tremendous amount of stuff, and 2 people go in with all of this content sitting in this 3 big place and don't know what to go. 4 CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: 5 I see. Thank you. ARBITRATOR GULIN: Would you quess that 6 7 there's some correlation between the narrowing of the play lists on the radio and the narrowing of the 8 inventory at retail stores? 9 10 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't -- I wouldn't necessarily say as a blanket comment that there's a 11 12 narrowing of inventory at record stores, because there are quite a few stores that are these gigantic kind of 13 14 superstores that have everything. 15 I think that the process of -- it becomes 16 a much more difficult task to individually tailor for 17 the person that comes in to understand what they might 18 like and what might appeal to them when you've got 19 this tremendous store with 36,000 skews in it. To have somebody walk in, it's just -- I 20 21 don't know how often you gentlemen go to record 22 stores, but when you do go into those stores it's

1	difficult just to even find where the Beatles is. You
2	know, is it alphabetical? Is it in rock? Is it in
3	you know, where is it?
4	So I think it's just the nature of the
5	fact that they the age of the superstore is upon
6	us.
7	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: I've learned that you
8	have to ask somebody and
9	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Half the time they
10	don't know.
11	(Laughter.)
12	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: And they're used to
13	paying attention to a different age clientele.
14	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Right.
15	THE WITNESS: I used to be that person in
16	that store, and I really tried to make sure that I
17	knew who my customer was. But it's a rare thing these
18	days, unfortunately.
19	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
20	Q Mr. McDermott, going back to where we were
21	about the grass-roots type marketing to break new
22	bands, and stuff like that, let me contrast that for

1	a minute to a couple of the statements in your
2	prepared testimony where you talk about repetition on
3	broadcast radio as being really the key to broadcast
4	radio promotional benefit to the labels. You remember
5	testifying to that about
6	A Could you refer to a specific page, so I
7	can just understand what you're specifically referring
8	to.
9	Q Well, let me ask you this. It is a
10	correct statement, is it not, that you believe that
11	the biggest value to broadcast radio promotion is the
12	repetition that occurs when songs are played over and
13	over again on broadcast radio to a large market, and
14	that's what drives the promotional benefit for the
15	label?
16	MR. NEWBERG: Can you maybe break that up
17	into
18	MR. STEINTHAL: Okay.
19	MR. NEWBERG: one question at a time?
20	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: There is a paragraph
21	that's on page 3 that deals with that.
22	MR. STEINTHAL: Yes. The full paragraph

1	on page 3 before Section 2.
2	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
3	Q You're talking here about for a sound
4	recording to become popular it requires repetition,
5	and you focus on the values of repetition in broadcast
6	radio, is that right?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Now, I take it from what you've testified
9	to earlier today there's a bit of a chicken and egg
10	thing going on here. You've got to break the new band
11	before it can get that air play, which gets the
12	repetition, right?
13	A If you're talking about a major commercial
14	radio station in the major market, that's an accurate
15	statement. It is not it is a less accurate
16	statement if you're talking about college radio, let's
17	say, in a local market, because certainly records
18	break regionally at those different levels that I
19	referred to before.
20	Q But in terms of the most significant area
21	of promotional value of air play on radio to you in
22	your current position at Sony Music, you would say

it's the big market stations and the repetition they drive, right?

A The repetition is obviously of huge value to us. But I think that to characterize that as, let's say, the only thing that's valuable to us -- when a radio station gets behind a record, there's a tremendous amount of stuff that they do for it. There are local events with the artists. They have the artists come on air. They will sponsor concerts. They run contests with their listeners.

So the repetition is part of a -- really, when a station decides to play a record that much, they really decide to get behind an artist. So, yes, the repetition is of huge value. But the repetition has to have this kind of thread of a marketing message that's conveyed to the consumer in that market. And when you add those two things together, that's when we start to see sales.

Q So you agree with the notion that the principal effect on sales is from the big market, but you would also agree, I take it, that it's important to engage in promotional activities that will help

1.8

1	break new bands, whether at college radio or other
2	kinds of alternative media as specified before, right?
3	MR. NEWBERG: Again, I'm going to just
4	object. That's two questions. If you want to ask
5	him, first, if he agrees with one statement, and then
6	with the other.
7	MR. STEINTHAL: I think it was understood
8	by the witness.
9	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: The objection is
10	compound question?
11	MR. NEWBERG: Yes. He assumed that he
12	agreed with one statement, and then said, "Since you
13	agree with that, do you agree with this?" I'd prefer
14	if he asked whether or not he agrees with the first
15	statement to begin with.
16	MR. STEINTHAL: I'm happy to break it up.
17	I think it was understood, but I'll break it up.
18	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Thank you.
19	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
20	Q I take it from your last answer that you
21	believe that the principal effect of promotion are
22	felt by large market stations and the repetition they

T	generate of sound recordings, correct?
2	A When you want to start selling millions of
3	records, that's the level you want to be at.
4	Q But at the same time, you would agree with
5	the premise that it's important to have promotional
6	activities in the alternative media that you specified
7	previously, in part to generate the opportunity to
8	reach broadcast radio media, correct?
9	A Correct. It's a symbiotic relationship.
LO	Q Now, you're familiar with the fact, are
L1	you not, that there are some artists whose careers
L2	have actually taken off after significant internet
L3	exposure before having gotten major broadcast radio
L4	exposure, correct?
L5	A I would tend to disagree with that
L6	characterization. In my experience, having done
L7	internet marketing for since 1994, 1995, there
L8	hasn't been one shining example that the internet
L9	community has been able to show and say, "This
20	happened because of the internet."
21	Internet has always been a factor, and
22	it's what I do for a living. So if I were to say it's
	1

1	of no value, I'd be, you know, on a bread line
2	somewhere. But I would not say that there's really
3	any artist that we can point to and say, "The internet
4	broke this band by the traditional yardstick that the
5	record industry would use." Started yes, broke no.
6	Q Okay. Let me, then, distinguish between
7	those two words in your mind. Would it be fair to say
8	that the internet has created helped create, as you
9	say, a start in the sense that it's created a buzz
10	about someone that has helped launch a successful
11	recording career?
12	A Back to your chicken and egg comment,
13	usually what happens is we sign an act, and then use
14	the internet to help make people aware of that act.
15	It isn't necessarily the case, in my experience, that
16	the internet makes us aware of something which then we
17	take to the next level.
18	Q That's a fair distinction. So that the
19	internet, then, is one of those alternative media that
20	you're exploiting to try to create awareness of new
21	artists where broadcast radio has made it harder to
22	launch new artists because they're constricted play

lists, right?

A Yes. But I wouldn't want to characterize

-- I wouldn't want to limit the characterization of
the promotional value of the internet to just new
artists. It's -- we also do things with major artists
online as well.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Can you explain the two terms you've distinguished -- start an artist and break an artist?

THE WITNESS: Start an artist is you get handed a tape, and maybe an artist has -- they got signed out of Philadelphia, and they've been playing clubs, and nobody has really ever heard of them. And you have to figure by listening to that record who might be the appropriate age demographic for that, what markets you might want to try to start that artist in, what type of music it is, so that then you can figure out what kind of print magazine campaign do I want to come up with, do I want to do a video for this artist. It's really starting from -- from almost nothing.

When you break an artist is when you've

built kind of this groundswell up to the point where a lot of people are paying attention and you kind of cross -- you're crossing that bridge between not a lot of people know, not a lot of people care, to there's enough of a spark there where the people who pay attention to things that really sell start to notice. And that's when you break an artist. It's really when you cross over from the unknown to the known. ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Is that point

measurable, for example, in sales of records? Do you say, "After 100,000 CDs, we -- we've broken it"? there an objective measure?

THE WITNESS: There are objective measures that are based on each individual project, and it's -certainly, if you're talking about something like a mainstream pop act, if you only sold 20,000 records, let's say, you would consider that to be a stunning failure. But if you had a punk band that, you know, you figured had very limited crossover commercial potential, 20,000 records actually might be very successful.

So, yes, there are criteria that you can

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	use, but it's based, really, on the individual
2	product.
3	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
4	Q Mr. McDermott, there was some testimony
5	earlier in the case that certain webcasters that offer
6	a multiplicity of different kinds of stations have
7	been looked at almost like the small market stations
8	or college radio stations in the broadcast spectrum,
9	insofar as they give an opportunity to have a wider
10	play list and a deeper play list for artists that more
11	conform to a niche.
12	A I'm sorry. Could you more specifically
13	characterize or name what you mean by what who
14	you're talking about?
15	Q For example, let's assume we have a
16	webcaster that offers, you know, 40 or more
17	different
18	A SonicNet?
19	Q SonicNet. Take SonicNet.
20	A Okay.
21	Q And it has programmers that have
22	experience in broadcast radio, and they've put

1	together channels that are more geared to a specific
2	demographic. And, indeed, there was testimony from
3	someone Quincy McCoy from SonicNet, who you may
4	know. Do you know Quincy?
5	A We've sat across the table a few times.
6	Q And he was analogizing, to some degree,
7	the smaller market stations that have been used as
8	test beds, if you will, to break new artists by record
9	companies, at least to try to get air play in niche
10	areas with certain kinds of stations that are
11	available on a webcaster like a Radio SonicNet.
12	Is it fair to say that the play list
13	flexibility that a webcaster like SonicNet has for the
14	niches that it offers is comparable to the play list
15	flexibility that a smaller market radio station has:
16	A Probably not. College even college
17	radio stations do have play lists. There is a certair
18	amount of flexibility. But in order to be successful,
19	if you had every person on a station that would
20	have any responsibility to success, if you had a
21	station where you had no idea what was going to be
22	played on that station at any given time, it would

inherently, by that very nature, be unsuccessful 1 because it would be such a potpourri of music that I 2 3 don't know that -- how that would appeal to anybody. I mean, if you heard the Sex Pistols this 4 5 hour, and then the next hour you heard, you know, 6 Beethoven, I don't know who that would necessarily 7 appeal to. Q Well, but take for the assumption that you 8 9 were simply, on a given channel, limiting your play list to a discrete niche, not going from classical to 10 11 the Sex Pistols, but the Sex Pistols and a whole bunch 12 of other, you know, pop bands or alternative rock 13 bands that may not have the same notoriety as the Sex 14 Pistols but are of the same milieu and the same niche, 15 wouldn't it be the case that the greater flexibility 16 they have with play lists in terms of what they can offer makes them -- those webcast channels that are 17 18 oriented that way -- similar in many respects to the kinds of college radio stations and other kinds of 19 20 stations that have been used by the labels as test 21 beds, for example? 22 I have a difficult time making analogies

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

between what someone like SonicNet does in terms of offering a tremendously deep amount of genres that are very niche-oriented -- one-stop shopping for all of that -- and a college radio station.

Q Have you done -- I'm sorry. I was going to ask whether you've done any comparison of the actual play lists on stations like Radio SonicNet has in the alternative rock area and what you might find at the Ithaca College radio station, for example, which is near and dear to my heart, since my son works there.

## (Laughter.)

A I listen to -- I listen to a fair amount of webcasting because it interests me, not just because it has bearing on today's proceedings. And I am also a big fan of radio, and I would say that to me webcasting and what terrestrial radio stations do is -- is a very, very different experience.

And I have a difficult time, having spent a lot of time playing around with both, drawing a lot of concrete analogies between the two in terms of programming.

1	Q Let me ask you
2	A You don't often get somebody well, you
3	never get it on SonicNet. But you don't often get a
4	DJ talking about how they broke up with their
5	girlfriend, so they're going to play some angry song
6	by Black Flag, you know.
7	Q Well, let me ask you this
8	A Unlike college radio.
9	Q I was struck by the comment in your
LO	written statement that DJ patter was promotional.
L1	Have you also heard it publicized in the trades that
L2	people get tired of hearing the DJs just go on and on
L3	and on about irrelevant things, and, therefore, often
L4	switch stations precisely because of the moronic DJ
L5	patter that's out there?
L6	A Again, I've been in the record business
L7	most of my adult life. I mean, I'm 36 and I've been
L8	in the business since 1984. I remember the days when
L9	a DJ like Scott Muny in New York I wouldn't
20	characterize or Vin Skelsa. I wouldn't
21	characterize what they said about our music as patter
22	or or like the radio stations in New York now I

think what turns people off are these DJs who do all 1 this kind of shock stuff and yell and scream at 2 3 people. That turns me off. That has nothing to do 4 5 with music. That's, you know, the Howard Stern kind 6 of a thing I think is probably what people are more 7 talking about. When it -- when you have somebody who really knows music and talks about it, and you trust 8 9 them, that to me is not patter. 10 Q That's a big "if," though. Let's take, 11 for example, morning drive time with Z100 or some 12 other pop station like that. You'd agree with me that 13 the kinds of patter that you're getting on major 14 broadcast stations in drive time is not about the 15 music, it's about what's happening in the world or 16 what's happening in their sex lives or whatever it may 17 be, and that has turned a lot of people off, hasn't it? 18 19 Yeah, I'd agree with that. Α 20 Q Now, you mentioned in your initial answers to some questions about background that you've been 21 22 involved -- and I think it was when you were at

1	Polygram in the development of policies on the
2	internet or in connection with the internet. What
3	kind of policies were you involved in generating in
4	that area?
5	A Promotional and commercial uses of our
6	intellectual property in the new media space.
7	Q What kind of policies were created with
8	respect to that?
9	A There
10	MR. NEWBERG: I'm just going to ask, are
11	you talking about Polygram policies or Sony policies?
12	MR. STEINTHAL: Really, either. I'm
13	curious what policies, in his experience at either
14	Polygram or Sony, have been developed in connection
15	with internet music
16	MR. NEWBERG: There are I believe his
17	testimony only refers to his policy creation at Sony.
18	MR. STEINTHAL: All right. We'll stick
19	with that.
20	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
21	Q What kind of policy areas have you been
22	involved in creating with respect to internet?

1	A I could speak generally in terms of
2	ideology. But in terms of specific policies in an
3	open forum, that's some of that is proprietary to
4	Sony.
5	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: What we can do, in the
6	interest of full information, it's a very simple
7	matter for us to go into closed session. And, for
8	example, the part of your testimony that deals with
9	some of the specific Sony one-off deals with
10	individual casters, that's all in as restricted
11	information. And certainly, when we come to that
12	point, we'll do it in restricted.
13	So we could we can go on a restricted
14	record right now, so that you can feel comfortable
15	about talking about Sony policies without that
16	becoming part of the public record.
17	MR. GARRETT: I think we should go into
18	restricted session.
19	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: And that means it's
20	not public, and there's a limited audience of people
21	who will have access to it.
22	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Right. And it also

1	means that the everyone who does have access is
2	has signed agreements and is limited, and the Court
3	Reporter's record of this of our overall hearing
4	doesn't include these pages, the part that's filed
5	public that is available to the public to review.
6	So, John, if we could go on restricted
7	or closed session.
8	(Whereupon, at 9:41 a.m., the proceedings
9	went into Closed Session.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

BY MR. STEINTHAL:

Q Now, the labels do special promotions on broadcast radio, do they not? Separate and apart from generating air play, they do giveaways and contests and promotions to, you know, help launch the new release of an album, for example, correct?

A Yes.

Q And what are the nature of those kinds of promotions and the benefits that you think are derived from those kinds of promotions?

A Well, there's a -- when I first started working for a record label back in 1987 there was a -- there was a poster that was up when I walked in the lobby and it said, "A funny thing happens when you don't market. Nothing." And there was a picture of a desert island.

We -- the nature of those and what we get from those kind of promotions is this is show business. And when you have a really good record, and you attach those promotions around it and those events, it just raises the element of show business, and it becomes more attractive to people.

1	So a big part of what we do now in the
2	music the movie industry I think does very similar
3	things as well is we try to make records, certain
4	types of records, into events, so that people pay more
5	attention to them.
6	Q And when you talk in your writter
7	testimony about a series of I think what you call one-
8	offs that you've done with MTV and other webcasters
9	A Yes, sir.
10	Q are those one-offs similar in kind to
11	the kinds of promotions that you're talking about that
12	you do on radio upon the release of an album, where
13	it's not so much focused on getting into a play list
14	as it is focused on getting people's attention about
15	a new release and a driving promotion associated with
16	that new release?
17	A There are elements that are similar,
18	certainly, obviously. There are things, though, that
19	we get in these kind of promotions that we would never
20	get from a regular radio station, things like links
21	directly to artist sites, so that people can go right
22	to the artist's website.

1	In a lot of cases, we actually when
2	people participate in these contests, as you can see
3	in some of the attachments, in all of the attachments,
4	we get their e-mail addresses. We give consumers the
5	opportunity to find out more about that artist. And
6	when we go
7	MR. NEWBERG: If I could just interrupt
8	for a second. If you feel that any of this should be
9	on restricted, just please let us know.
10	THE WITNESS: Okay. So there are similar
11	parts to it, but there are also other things that we
12	get that we would probably never really get in the
13	terrestrial world, or it would be difficult to get in
14	the terrestrial world.
15	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
16	Q Difficult in part because the terrestrial
17	world doesn't just have that kind of information or
18	data to give, right?
19	A Or it would be laborious for them to get
20	it. I mean, I in the old days when I used to do
21	retail marketing, we would do a contest and I'd get a
22	big box with people's names written on a little slip

1	of paper. And, you know, you'd get a box at the end
2	of a promotion with all of the stores. You'd have,
3	you know, Hefty bags full of names.
4	Then you had to go to the intern down the
5	hall and go, "Could you take these three Hefty bags
6	and put them on index cards?" You know, the
7	technology is obviously a lot easier when you're
8	dealing with databases and you just click a button and
9	put in your e-mail address, so, yeah.
10	Q And on both the promotions we've been
11	talking about in broadcast radio and these one-offs or
12	the internet, the reality is that in the ordinary
13	course there's no cash that changes hands on that.
14	You're providing the requisite content, if you will,
15	for the promotion in
16	A Online or offline?
17	Q Both.
18	A There have been some examples in the
19	online world, mostly outside the United States, where
20	we have actually gotten financial compensation for
21	those promotions.
22	Q But otherwise, it's pretty much no cash,

1	no cash, right?
2	A If you're asking if the question is
3	specific to cash, yes. But I don't want to
4	characterize cash as being the only value that we
5	might want to get in kind, because there is quite a
6	sizeable amount of value that we get in other areas,
7	which, again, I
8	Q Which you talk about in your testimony.
9	A Yes.
10	Q Okay. One of the experts in this case
11	said something about repetition that seemed a little
12	bit inconsistent with your testimony about it, so ]
13	just want to draw your attention. I'm going to read
14	to you from paragraph 42 of one of the RIAA's rebuttal
15	statements.
16	A Could I get a copy of that, so that I
17	could look at it for myself and understand the
18	context?
19	Q Sure. This is from Mr. Schink, his
20	rebuttal statement. And in particular I'll show it
21	to you but at the end of paragraph 42 he talks
22	about sales losses because people heard the album and

1	did not like it or because they were overexposed to
2	the album through repeated radio plays, i.e. they
3	heard it too often and lost interest in purchasing it.
4	And I just wonder whether you would agree
5	that there is some actual detrimental impact
6	associated with too much repetition on broadcast
7	radio.
8	A Do you know where exactly it is?
9	Q It's in paragraph 42 at the very
10	A Oh, here we go. Could you just give me a
11	moment?
12	Q Sure.
13	A I'll try to read it as quickly as
14	possible.
15	(Pause.)
16	So what how would you like me to in
17	what context do you want me to respond to this?
18	Q I'm just curious whether you agree with
19	the suggestion that too much repetition can be
20	displacing, because people hear too much of what they
21	want to hear and they don't want to hear it anymore.
22	A I think that those circumstances are

fairly unique. There certainly have been times when, let's say, there was a point when Hootie and The Blowfish was really getting on my nerves, because they just played Hootie and The Blowfish so much, and you saw them every time you turned on TV.

But those kind of -- or you could say the same about Madonna or in the '80s when Michael Jackson's Thriller came out. It seemed like all media was saturated with Michael Jackson. And at that point, yeah, you know, at some point people will get tired of that. At some point. But before they got tired of that, we sold many, many, many millions of records, and people had a voracious appetite.

So in order to get to the point where things are overexposed, there has to -- the voracious appetite has to exist to begin with.

Q Okay.

A And I would also say I'm not familiar with the gentleman who brought this up as testimony, and I don't know what context he made this in, so I apologize that I can't give a more -- an answer that more applies to what -- the point he was trying to

1 make --2 Q Okay. Α -- because I don't know what point he was 3 trying to make. 4 5 Q Fair enough. 6 ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Well, is there, in 7 this area, sort of a -- kind of a typical life cycle, if you were, that once you break the band and you get 8 9 the big stations playing it, and you want that 10 repetition, and you want a lot of air play, and it promotes sales, and it's on there for two weeks, four 11 12 weeks, six weeks, eight weeks, 10 weeks, I don't know, 13 some -- at some period of time it probably, I would 14 have thought, eventually begins to run its course, and 15 the sales begin to decline a little, and you're ready to push something else, and the added repetition is 16 17 having sort of diminishing -- you know, the law of diminishing returns is setting in. 18 I don't know 19 whether that's 40 weeks or 80 weeks or what it is. probably varies from artist to artist. 20

But there comes some period of time when I would assume it's sort of tailing off, and now it's

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

21

time to find something else to stick on there constantly. Is that sort of the way it works?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And that ebbs and flows depending on what a single is. You might have a really big single that lasts for months and months and has recurrent air play. And then that starts to go away and you're trying to push the new single.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: What is it -- if you can -- and it probably varies a lot from genre to genre, but is there sort of a -- what is the typical, you know, period of time you think you've got to really -- to have a lot of air play and a lot of sales? Is it sort of a -- you know, four months is kind of a standard length or two months or six months? Or what is kind of the typical moment in the sun for a given record that is getting a lot of air play, getting a lot of sales, and then beginning to tail off?

THE WITNESS: A big record could be several months of activity, and then it will -- if it was a really big record, it will go into kind of a recurrent situation on the radio station. If the

radio stations are still getting feedback in their 1 callouts -- they do a lot of research -- they'll 2 continue to play it for a longer period of time. 3 But we can be on and off records literally 4 5 from week to week. I've been in meetings where a 6 record was huge this week and then we -- we went out 7 and we did research, and the research came back, "This isn't going to pop." So we moved to the next record 8 9 really quickly. 10 But successful record, best case 11 scenario, probably three months. ARBITRATOR VON KANN: 12 Okay. 13 BY MR. STEINTHAL: 14 Mr. McDermott, at pages 4 --CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Let me just -- excuse 15 16 When you say "week to week" or "best case three 17 months," am I understanding correctly you're talking 18 about the length of time that Sony, for example, would 19 really be pushing a record? You might decide, well, 20 this is -- three months is enough, and the radio stations might still play it a lot, even --21 22 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

1	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: even though you're
2	not pushing it.
3	THE WITNESS: As a matter of fact, I
4	assume everybody probably recalls when there was the
5	Latin explosion in the music industry a couple of
6	summers ago, and Ricky Martin La Vida Loca was the
7	theme, really, of the summer, which was great because
8	it was a Sony record.
9	(Laughter.)
10	But we had subsequent singles that we
11	wanted to work, but they only wanted to be about La
12	Vida Loca. And when our promo reps went and actually
13	tried to get them to move on to the next single, the
14	public wanted that record, so we had to wait.
15	And as a result, a lot of the marketing
16	that we did behind that, you know, because you buy
17	print ads, you commit ahead of time because there's
18	such long lead times on advertising, advertising a new
19	single, and we had to rush and, you know, put all of
20	that stuff aside, delay all of it.
21	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
22	Q Mr. McDermott, you state in your written

starting at page 3 under the caption testimony, "Webcasters Promotional Claims," you talk about various features that the webcasters have claimed to be promotional and state that in your view they are not promotional. Is that a fair summary of that part of your testimony? Absolutely. Are you aware of any data that supports the view that the specific features that you've referred to are not promotional? Α Not off hand. The business our business is based a lot on instinct, and it's about keeping your ear to the ground. It's about watching consumer habits, and it's about living a lifestyle.

So I think in any creative industry you have to have those instincts and get a feeling for where you think things are going, because if you wait for -- there is no manual that says how to make -- here's a hit movie, how to make a hit record, how the record industry is going to evolve. You have to look at the signs, and that's based on doing this for the past eight or nine years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That's why I so fervently believe that it 1 is not -- that this functionality -- and I assume, 2 tell me if I'm wrong, that you're referring to --3 we're starting to get into things like the skip 4 5 functionality and personalization. 6 Well, it's all the features that you refer 7 to in Section 2 of your testimony, including not just the skip features but the chat rooms, the ability to 8 9 play deeper in play lists, and the like. And I quess 10 my question -- and you've already answered it to some 11 degree -- let me ask you separately. Did you seek to 12 generate data to support the proposition that these 13 features did not have a promotional benefit to the 14 label community? I think that what we did was -- and 15 Α 16 what you do every day in this business because it 17 changes so quickly -- again, is you make calculations 18 based on your experiences and what's happening in the 19 industry. 20 If I were to look at the two main research 21 firms' statements about how the music industry was 22 going to evolve -- the digital music space was going

1	to evolve, those two main researchers being Forrester
2	and Jupiter, and look at all of their projections,
3	nearly all of their projections about everything in
4	this space have been wrong for the past five or six
5	years.
6	And we've had instincts which completely
7	contradicted what their projections were, and our
8	instincts were right. So I have a very high degree of
9	confidence in what our determinations about how this
10	space is going to evolve is.
11	Q And the Jupiter you're referring to is
12	Jupiter Media Metrix?
13	A Jupiter Communications, their research
14	reports on the music industry. Both they and
15	Forrester do a tremendous amount of research into
16	space.
17	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Jupiter we've heard
18	of. Forrester I don't think I have. Who are they?
19	THE WITNESS: Forrester Research is
20	another one of these they're analogous to
21	they're a little bit more officious than Jupiter.
22	BY MR. STEINTHAL:

1	Q Now, in your discussion of features of
2	webcasting that are non-promotional, I don't think you
3	talked about the buy buttons that many webcasters
4	have. You would agree, would you not, that the
5	presence of a buy button does have the ability to
6	facilitate impulse buying?
7	MR. NEWBERG: Just as a point of
8	clarification, there is some small discussion of buy
9	buttons on the top of page 7.
10	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Page 7?
11	MR. NEWBERG: Yes, the top of page 7.
12	THE WITNESS: I would certainly agree that
13	by having a buy button there it creates an opportunity
14	for a sale. Unfortunately, it has not turned out that
15	it actually generates significant sales, in my
16	experience, and I have some very specific experiences
17	with buy buttons and the end result. And it's nothing
18	to get too excited about.
19	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
20	Q Have you done an analysis of the pricing
21	for a lot of the online merchants against the pricing
22	available in brick and mortar stores?

1	A Yes. You know, I think generally the
2	online merchants try to offset the fact that there
3	isn't the instant gratification of walking out of a
4	store with a product, and the fact that, you know,
5	they have shipping costs. And they try to usually
6	have the prices of their products be lower than they
7	would be at retail.
8	But then, when you factor in things like
9	shipping and handling, it probably ends up being right
10	about the same price as retail. That's one of the
11	reasons why online retailers are always coming up with
12	different kind of promotions, like buy two get one
13	free, 40 percent discounts across the board, that kind
14	of stuff.
15	Q Now, in reaching the conclusions strike
16	that.
17	On page 4, at one point you suggest that
18	webcasting can actually be displacing of CD sales. Do
19	you remember testifying to that effect?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Well, let me ask you the same question I
22	asked you before on that. Did you have any data that

you consulted or sought to generate on that subject? 1 No, although I can tell you that that is 2 Α 3 -- that ideology is a thread that runs through the way we do business in this whole space. We are in an era 4 5 where we feel very strongly that the physical good is 6 going to go away, and we're not going to be a widget 7 company. We're going to be an intellectual property 8 company. 9 And trying to figure out a way to monetize 10 all of this new access and availability to content is 11 really what my game is about on a day-to-day basis. 12 I mean, to be honest with you, the selling of CD sales as a result of all of this stuff is really not why I'm 13 14 doing this, and it's not really my charge. 15 My charge is to figure out when the CD sales go away, and this is our business. 16 How do we 17 pay the artists? How do we stay in business? know? 18 19 0 talking about the digital Are you 20 distribution business? 21 Α As a -- yes, as a general space. 22 0 That's what I thought.

1	Well, let's focus on just webcasting for
2	a moment, not digital downloads, not on-demand
3	streaming, not companies like Pressplay or MusicNet
4	that provide for the distribution of timed-out
5	downloads, etcetera. Let's put all that aside and
6	just
7	A Okay. Well, I understand that, but my
8	comment applies to webcasters as well.
9	Q Okay. Well, what I want to do is focus on
10	what, if any, data that you are aware of to support
11	the notion that webcasting, as it exists today,
12	subject to the DMCA performing rights complement and
13	performance complement and the other limitations of
14	the statute, whether such webcasting actually
15	displaces record sales. Are you aware of any data
16	that supports that?
17	MR. NEWBERG: If you understand what the
18	performance complement is.
19	THE WITNESS: I was about to say I'm not
20	an expert on all the ins and outs of the performance
21	complement. But if you are there seems to be kind
22	of a thread that you keep asking me for supporting

data for all these conclusions, and I quess as a 1 general response to that question I doubt when the wax 2 3 cylinder was invented that the person who invented it knew that Sony was going to have over a billion 4 dollars in turnover in 1999. 5 6 We try to look at supporting research for 7 all of these conclusions. But, again, it's more about feel. It's more about the instinct. It's more about 8 9 meeting with multitudes of customers, only 10 webcasters or potential new partners, only digital 11 webcasters, but download providers, 12 subscription services, lots of different types of 13 media partners, and just kind of taking this -- all 14 this opportunity and figuring out, well, if all of 15 this opportunity -- if any of it connects, where do 16 you end up going? I think it would be naive of anyone to 17 think that because of all of this ease of distribution 18 we weren't going to start moving away from a physical 19 20 good world. BY MR. STEINTHAL: 21

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

And all I'm asking you to do, and I really

1	think it's important for this proceeding to do this
2	A Okay.
3	Q is put aside digital downloads, put
4	aside on-demand streaming, and just limit the question
5	to the radio-like streaming of music on the internet
6	subject to the limitations of the compulsory license.
7	And my question is whether you're aware of any data
8	that supports the proposition that that kind of music
9	streaming either has resulted in or will result in any
10	loss of CD sales to the label community, by the end of
11	next year, for example.
12	A Not any specific research. But when you
13	mentioned radio-like, I just want to clarify, are you
14	talking about terrestrial rebroadcasters when you say
15	"radio-like"? Or are you talking about webcasters
16	that aren't terrestrial?
17	Q I'm talking about both. Is your answer
18	any different if it's both?
19	A Well, I would just say that those are two
20	different types of certainly content plays, so I just
21	wanted to know what you were referring to.
22	Q And my answer is my question is, would

your answer be any different knowing that I meant 1 both? 2 Α No, I just wanted to understand the 3 4 question. Now, it talks about -- or you talked about 5 0 6 the long-term sort of fear or concern that you're 7 moving out of the traditional going to be 8 marketplace. Is that a fair statement? 9 I wouldn't characterize it as a fear. is certainly part of our business strategy that the 10 physical good is going to go away at some point, and 11 12 we are an intellectual property business. How that 13 gets carried or how it gets delivered is really 14 irrelevant. 15 But if it's just bits, we've got to get 16 paid for the bits. I think there's an unfortunate 17 perception that the value of music is really based 18 around the cost of the physical carrier. So we've got 19 a much -- and that's a burden that we kind of carry 20 into other places, which is what we're trying to 21 change.

Well, you were in the media business when

Q

1	the VCRs first came out, were you not?
2	A No, I was in junior high school. But
3	(Laughter.)
4	Q Okay. Were you at your first mom and
5	pop
6	A Not yet. Not yet. But I remember when
7	they came out, and they were about this tall and they
8	weighed about 200 pounds.
9	Q Well, in the context of your current job,
10	has it come across in discussion internally at Sony
11	that there were similar fears at the point in time
12	when the VCR came out that people would just rent
13	movies, watch them at home, and it would have a
14	negative impact on the theatrical distribution
15	marketplace?
16	A I know this analogy comes up endlessly
17	when it comes to digital the digital distribution
18	space, the VCR, and how great it was for the record
19	industry the movie industry. But in renting a
20	movie you still have the act of getting in your car,
21	going and picking it, hoping that they have everything
22	that you're looking for, standing in line with a bunch

of other people, getting it home, getting the chance 1 to watch it, dealing with the late fees, returning it, 2 all of that kind of stuff. 3 This is a very different space than that. 4 There isn't that physicality attached to it. 5 So to 6 make analogies to something that to me exists very 7 much in the analog world, and try to make those digital analogies in the world, 8 to 9 inappropriate comparison. But it does come up from time to time 10 0 internally at Sony, does it not? 11 12 Α No. It comes up as a -- are we going to 13 hear another pitch where somebody tries to compare the digital media space to the VCR business? 14 15 0 Okay. 16 ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Can I just ask you about this notion that we are moving -- what you seem 17 18 to be saying, which seems to make sense to me, is that 19 at some point down the road, 20 years from now, 10 20 years from now, who knows, your record is not -- your business is not going to depend upon the sale of how 21 22 many little metal discs you've sold but how many songs

you have sold, probably transmitted in some digital fashion.

That does not strike me as bad. Indeed, it looks to me like there could be tremendous advantages to that. All of the expensive production stuff generating all of those little discs and studios and records, you know, shipping and all of that, disappears.

I would have thought potentially the costs go down dramatically and that, indeed, you know, the record companies might be looking forward to this as a golden era when it's going to be much cheaper to get our songs out in this vehicle. Our production costs will go down, our manufacturing costs.

So long as we can make sure that we've got good, solid distribution mechanisms, be they Pressplay and -- what's the other one? MusicNet or something else -- that we will be able to capitalize on it.

So when you speak about we're moving away from a physical products to an intellectual property business, which seems to me to be inevitable, from our point of view, where we're supposed to be looking at

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	the potential promotional or displacement effects, it
2	seems to me we maybe we should be maybe I have been
3	thinking about this too narrowly.
4	Maybe the question isn't, will webcasting
5	increase or decrease the sale of little pieces of
6	plastic discs? Will it increase or decrease the sale
7	of songs? Sound-recorded songs. Perhaps transmitted
8	digitally as opposed to through a piece of plastic.
9	And I guess I'm wondering whether you have
10	at Sony at this point any data about that. Sony has
11	let's break it up if I can into some of the
12	companies I can't remember whether Sony is one
13	have licensed some interactive services, correct?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
15	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Has Sony done that?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
17	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: So there are some
18	number of people who are downloading your music, and
19	you're getting royalties from that.
20	THE WITNESS: We will be, yes, sir.
21	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: And Sony is
22	participating probably, or plans to, in one of these

two, MusicNet or Pressplay?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And licensing to a whole host of folks as well.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: And licensing. It may be too early to tell at this point, but do you have any sense at all that although maybe, hypothetically, revenue is beginning to decline a bit from the sales of little plastic discs, compensating revenue is increasing from the sales and the royalties through digital transmission. Is that beginning -- is anybody -- have you analyzed that yet at Sony?

Sony -- actually, Sony Music was the first company to start selling digital downloads, legitimate commercial digital downloads, back in April of 2000. The difficult thing is because there have been so many illegitimate alternatives, it's very difficult to convince consumers that there is enough value there to actually pay anything.

So we have seen, particularly in markets outside the U.S., in Europe, the CD burning business, particularly in companies like Germany -- the German

company has been -- I don't have the specific numbers, unfortunately, but the managing director of Germany characterized it the last time I met with him as his business was decimated by the CD burning business.

We, as an industry, have been flat. So the difficult thing is with things like Napster -- and, obviously, one of the reasons why we fought that battle so hard was we were trying to create something legitimate, and there was all this discussion about, well, maybe Napster is legitimate, and maybe it's not. And while that was happening, consumers had a choice of either paying, you know, \$1.99 for one of our downloads, or going onto Napster and getting every piece of music in recorded history for free.

So it was -- it's difficult to show that the revenue that you mentioned going up is actually -- has actually been going up. Part of the reason why I was eager to come down here and testify was there's a lot of discussion about how this -- these types of services are promotional for the physical good.

And what worries me about that is we're in a time now where there isn't this hard data written on

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

a piece of paper that says the physical good is in trouble to the degree maybe that would make it absolutely crystal clear.

And there's this argument that it's -that this is promotional. If it's promotional of a
physical good, and the physical good goes away, and
the rate has been predicated on the fact that this is
promoting physical goods, and then this turns into the
business, we're in trouble.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Because we don't -this may be -- maybe this will be a legal question for
counsel. I'm not sure. I'm not sure we have to limit
our analysis to what -- what impact does webcasting
have on the sale of physical goods. It may be that if
people listen to streaming and like it, they flip over
to Pressplay and buy it, or some other service for
which you get revenue income.

So it may be that, you know, to -- it seems to me you are bound to be correct that we are -- we are gradually moving out of the CD era. Whether it's two years, five years, I don't know what, but we're bound to be moving out of it into a digital era.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

THE WITNESS: Which I think is -- which will be difficult the more interactivity and functionality is part of a baseline service, because the more functionality you include it becomes more substitutional, and there is less reason for a consumer to move to a different product, which the -- the main selling point is increased functionality or selection.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Let me ask you one other thing. You said you're not aware at this point of any data that would support the proposition that the physical good is in trouble, although I think you instinctively feel it is. You also said that you are aware of sales that have been generated by buy buttons, and it's nothing too exciting.

But does Sony have some way of knowing when, I don't know, some number of records gets sold through Amazon.com, that that came in through buy button services as opposed to on a webcasting service, as opposed to I guess somebody going directly to Amazon.com and ordering? Do you have any way of telling what sales have been generated by buy buttons

on these web streaming services? 1 THE WITNESS: Well, there's two ways that 2 3 we could tell, so, yes. One is when we are dealing with people like Amazon or CDNow, they will say to us, 4 5 not down to the very specific because they -- it would be inappropriate to disclose that. But they will say, 6 7 "X percentage of our business comes from clickthroughs." They might say, "X percentage of our 8 9 business comes from click-throughs from webcasters." 10 The other way that we would have of 11 knowing is by setting up a promotion ourselves which had a buy button on it. 12 (Whereupon, at 10:20 a.m., the proceedings 13 went into Closed Session.) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

1	THE WITNESS: And is there a particular
2	page you'd like me to refer to?
3	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
4	Q It's very general, so I don't think we
5	need to refer to it.
6	A Okay.
7	Q But in your testimony that we've already
8	started to talk about a little bit about potential
9	displacement concerns associated with webcasting.
10	A Right.
11	Q Did you consider or factor in in reaching
12	your conclusions or giving your opinions the
13	difference between the CD quality of the transmission,
14	of course, that a purchase of a physical CD provides
15	and the much less than CD quality that most of the
16	webcasters transmit their music at?
17	A No. And the reason why we don't consider
18	that is I've seen the technical limitations over the
19	past five years when streaming first started. It
20	sounded terrible. It didn't work particularly well.
21	And the technical advances in sound quality, in
22	compression, the goal posts move every few months.

And I'm very highly confident that in a -- within the 1 few years, particularly as high bandwidth 2 next 3 penetration increases, that a better than analog radio sound quality will be available to people on the 4 5 internet. So if I predicated my deduction of value 6 7 on the fact that the sound quality wasn't good, I 8 would be living in a moment in time, which in my experience is a moment that lasts for a few months. 9 0 Well, you would agree that as of now, for 1.0 11 the period from the past up until the moment we're sitting here today, the vast predominance of streamed 12 music by webcasters is at bit rates that are under 13 30K, right? 14 15 Α I myself, because I have a DSL connection, 16 I listen to 128K streams all the time, and they sound There are plenty of -- we live in 17 pretty darn good. a world right now where, obviously, people have 56K 18 19 modems, and they can't get 128K content. So they have to listen at very low bit rates. 20 21 But there is a tremendous amount, 22 increasing amount of high bandwidth content available

1	that I think sounds very good.
2	Q So is your concern about displacement,
3	again, one of those concerns about where we're going
4	to be going and at a point in time when people can get
5	CD quality music on the internet from webcasters?
6	A Yeah, I'd say that's part of it.
7	Q Now, in your discussion about the skip
8	functionality and concerns you had about that
9	functionality in terms of its displacement, potential
10	displacement effect, let me ask you this. Would you
11	agree with me that there's a difference between
12	skipping to a song you know and merely skipping to
13	avoid a song that's currently streaming, but when you
14	don't know what the next song is going to be?
15	A If I knew exactly if I knew if there
16	was a play list that said, "Twenty songs from now is
17	Led Zeppelin," and I wanted to hear Led Zeppelin, it
18	would be certainly easier to click to exactly the song
19	I want to hear. Did that answer your question?
20	Q Well, maybe it did. Assume for the moment
21	that you don't know what the play list is, because
22	it's not published, and you're on a genre-based

station that has a lot of different artists and songs, and you don't know the next song or the -- you know, song three away from you.

Would you agree that the ability to skip is less displacing than it would be if you were in a situation where it was streaming on demand and you knew what the next song was?

A Skipping, in general, is hugely substitutional. Our songs are like little commercials for an artist. Any time you enable somebody to skip those little commercials and not hear it, the reason -- one of the reasons why terrestrial radio is so promotional is you're stuck there in your car, and you've got to listen to that song, and you have to deal with it. You could change the station if you want to, but you have to wait.

Q Well, let me ask you that. I mean, what is the fundamental difference between, "Gee, I don't like this song, and I'm in my car" and pressing a button to skip to a song on another station, and "I don't like this song on the internet," and skipping to get to the next song, not knowing what it's going to

be?

2.0

A Well, one is is that you're -- are you really -- I guess you're asking, what's the difference between the analog and the digital world?

Q No. I'm asking solely as to a skip functionality what the difference in the displacement effect is between having the ability to skip from one radio station to another when you don't like a song, or from one preset button on your home FM stereo to another preset button on your home FM stereo.

A Again, you know, this -- it's a complicated -- or it's a complex answer. But when you're listening in your car, you know, in New York, there's maybe three rock stations. And when you're clicking between those stations, chances are if I don't like a song on one station, I'm going to click to something else, and I might hear an advertisement or a commercial. It's very -- it's very limited, you know.

If I'm listening to the top 100 greatest rock songs of all time on VH-1.com, and I decide I don't like a song and I just go, click, and I hear the

next song, don't like that, click, I hear the next song, that's a very obviously different thing between 2 3 changing between radio stations in a market. In any given market you're going to have, 4 5 you know -- again, it's repetition. It's very narrow 6 availability of content. If you look at the VH-1 7 website and they have the top 100 sold records, the top 100 rock records, really the best of the best, and 8 9 you add skip functionality to it, that's a very 10 different thing than hoping that when I switch from 11 99.5 in New York when a DJ is talking about some nonsense, some patter, that I go to another station 12 13 and hope that another great song is playing on that 14 station. 15 Clicking through a list of the top 100 greatest hits -- greatest songs, I don't know how you 16 17 can draw the analogy, to be honest with you. 18 Q Let's put aside -- because I'm going to 19 ask you specifically about this. You keep on focusing 20 on the top 100 hits. 21 Okay. 22 0 There are hundreds or thousands of genre-

1	based radio stations out there that are not like that.
2	You would agree with me on that, right?
3	A Yes.
4	Q Okay. All of the Spinner stations, all of
5	the Net Radio stations, before they met their demise,
6	they're all genre-based stations that aren't top 100
7	only, right?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Okay. Let's limit to that for a minute.
LO	A Okay.
L1	Q If you're dealing with genre-based
L2	stations and the only difference between the skip
L3	functionality is between the broadcast spectrum is
L4	not liking a song and changing a station or the
L5	preset, and not liking a song on the internet and
L6	skipping to the next song not knowing what it's going
L7	to be, are you aware of any specific data or
L8	information that would reflect that the skipping on
L9	the webcast service would be more displacing than
20	skipping in the broadcast situation?
21	A I don't think I don't think you need
22	data. It's common sense. You're sitting listening to

1	the top to the to the '80s channel on Spinner.
	_
2	And as you're sitting there and you're going don't
3	like Tina Turner, okay, Wang Chung, like that, don't
4	like Wang Chung, I like Elton John, okay, click,
5	click, click, and you're just going through stuff.
6	It's like it's when you add skip
7	functionality it becomes very analogous to a jukebox
8	or a library of content. It gets very close to that
9	description of the celestial jukebox.
LO	I can't make the connection at all between
11	clicking between radio stations on my dashboard and
L2	then clicking within very narrowly-defined genres, and
L3	sorting through a wealth of content. They're two
L4	different mediums, and I think it's inappropriate to
L5	draw that kind of an analogy.
L6	Q Lastly, on this MTV or VH-1 top 100, are
L7	you familiar with all the playlists and what the
L8	programming is or was on those stations?
19	A I wouldn't say I'm familiar with all, but
20	I would say I'm probably more familiar than the man in
21	the street.
22	Q Do you know whether they're still

ᅩᆝ	available?
2	A Not as of this morning. As of last week,
3	they were.
4	Q Do you know whether those stations have
5	exclusively 100 songs in the playlist or those are
6	just emblematic of the content on those stations?
7	A I believe that it's emblematic of the
8	content of those stations. I don't think it's just
9	100 songs. I don't know. The content of this
1.0	changes so much in relation to all the various legal
11	goings on that could have changed this morning. I
12	don't know.
13	MR. STEINTHAL: I have no further
14	questions.
15	Tom?
16	MR. KIRBY: Yes, I do have some.
17	THE WITNESS: I'd like to run to the gents
1.8	just for a moment.
19	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: This is the time when
20	we normally take our morning break anyway. So why
21	don't we take until five minutes 'til.
22	THE WITNESS: Thank you.

1	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
2	the record at 10:37 a.m. and went back on
3	the record at 10:57 a.m.)
4	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Mr. McDermott, the
5	whole panel would like to express its appreciation for
6	your wisdom and foresight in reminding us that we
7	needed that break.
8	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: According to
9	Professor Jaffe, this will prove that none of us are
1.0	cut out to be negotiated.
11	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: This is Mr. Kirby who
12	has a few questions for you.
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. KIRBY:
14 15	BY MR. KIRBY:  Q Mr. McDermott, when you opened that third
15	Q Mr. McDermott, when you opened that third
15 16	Q Mr. McDermott, when you opened that third bottle, I was impressed. I checked, and you only got
15 16 17	Q Mr. McDermott, when you opened that third bottle, I was impressed. I checked, and you only got half way through it, so you're not the man I thought.
15 16 17	Q Mr. McDermott, when you opened that third bottle, I was impressed. I checked, and you only got half way through it, so you're not the man I thought.  But nonetheless, it was an impressive show.
15 16 17 18	Q Mr. McDermott, when you opened that third bottle, I was impressed. I checked, and you only got half way through it, so you're not the man I thought.  But nonetheless, it was an impressive show.  I'm representing Clear Channel, among

1	you remember saying that?
2	A It can, yes.
3	Q That's what I wanted to get to. Now,
4	there's a form of webcasting that I would call
5	simulcasting, where a radio station simply streams its
6	signal over the Internet. Are you familiar with that
7	kind of webcasting?
8	A Yes.
9	Q That experience is actually very similar
10	to terrestrial radio, isn't it?
11	A The programming, obviously, if it's a
12	rebroadcast or a retransmission, is similar. I would
13	say that the medium and the consumption experience is
14	dissimilar.
15	Q Well, it's certainly dissimilar, but
16	nonetheless, it's also similar. I mean, I don't want
17	to quibble about this, but fair enough. The
18	programming is similar.
19	Now, to the extent that you have one of
20	these radio-directed promotional efforts going on, and
21	that radio station is simply streaming its radio
22	signal so that other listeners can get it at their

1	workplace, for example, that's going to enhance your
2	promotional effort, isn't it?
3	A Not necessarily, because it no longer
4	becomes a regional thing, and it no longer
5	becomes it's also no longer as narrow a medium
6	because now the station has a global or well, a
7	national or a global presence to it so the things
8	that we find most appealing about the localization of
9	terrestrial station and all the promotion that goes
LO	into it. If someone's listening in New York about
L1	in-store that's taking place at Tower Records in
L2	Seattle, that's nowhere near as promotional.
L3	Q Okay. But let's break it down a little
L4	bit. You at least do have the song that you wanted
L5	over the Internet just like on the radio station,
L6	right?
L7	A If you're talking about yes.
L8	Q Do you know what percentage of listeners
L9	to these kind of streamed radio signals tend to be in
20	the same geographic area that the radio station
21	serves?
22	A I don't have specific information about

1	that, but I know that from what I've heard from
2	different web terrestrial rebroadcasters, part of
3	their pitch over the years has been, now it's great
4	because I have a national or global impact to
5	promoting things.
6	Q But people in this business say all sorts
7	of things without much basis, don't they?
8	A Yeah, but I think I don't know whether
9	this is still a trend. It is show business at the end
10	of the day.
11	Q That's fine. To the extent that listeners
12	happen to be in the same geographic areas the
13	station and are simply listening through their
14	workstation as opposed to the transistor radio up on
15	the bookshelf, then you're achieving very much the
16	same things with respect to those listeners that you
17	will be achieving through the person listening to the
18	radio, right?
19	A If the percentage of it if there
20	were if it was confined pretty much exclusively to
21	the people in the local market, it would have
22	similarities. But again, the medium I think is very

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

different.

The workplace computer just isn't as 0 friendly as the bedside alarm?

I just -- again, for the reasons I Α No. mentioned earlier about making analogy to a car radio, I think that there is a lot of new functionality and new revenue opportunities that are afforded webcasters and terrestrial rebroadcasters by the nature of the So if you're asking me whether or not the medium. content is exactly the same, and you're very narrowly asking that, then, yeah, I quess there are those But there are lots of other benefits as benefits. well. It's not a one for one comparison.

I understand. But the content would be the same, the timing would be the same, to the extent that the person is in the signal area of the station, the geographic location would be the same. those similarities, and as to those listeners where all three of those things are the same, you would expect pretty much the same promotional benefit to Sony, wouldn't you?

> No, I wouldn't expect the same promotional Α

1 | benefit.

2.0

Q Why would you expect a different promotional benefit?

A Because millions of people listen to that station in the physical world when they're on their way home or when they're at home, and there's a much small percentage of people that are actually listening on line. So I wouldn't characterize the medium as having the same promotional weight than it does in the physical world.

Q I understand.

A Again, it's a very limited amount of content, it's a limited amount of buttons on your radio; it's confined to that one region. You can't, to me, factor in all these other elements and all of this other ability to reach people outside of that market, and yet say it's exactly the same thing. I won't agree that it's exactly the same thing.

Q Well, let's try it this way. Per capita per listener minute, the promotional benefit to Sony of someone listening to a radio signal over the air and someone in the same geographical area listening to

1	the same signal over their computer is going to be
2	very similar, isn't it?
3	A There will be similarities. Yeah, I'll
4	give you that.
5	Q Okay. Now, one of the sort of messages I
6	take from your testimony is that both the music
7	industry and the intersection of the music industry
8	with the Internet are areas where things are changing
9	dramatically; is that fair?
10	A Yes, that's correct.
11	Q And to a substantial extent,
12	unpredictably; is that right?
13	A Yes.
14	Q For example, you believe the CDs are going
15	away, but you don't know exactly when they're going
16	away, do you?
17	A That's accurate, as in physical media; I
18	wouldn't confine it to the compact disc. I would say
19	physical media is going to I think decline over time
20	and access from remote places unconnected
21	access I think is going to increase. I think
22	everybody thinks that in all media, not just the

1	record business.
2	Q You said what that time line is, was three
3	years, five years, seven years, longer we just don't
4	really know for sure, do we?
5	A The signs are already there that it's
6	starting up.
7	Q Well, we know the direction but we don't
8	know the timing, right?
9	A Yeah.
10	Q Okay. And similarly, with respect to
11	exactly what technology is going to replace the
12	physical media, we don't know that yet either, do we?
13	A No, because as I mentioned previously when
1.4	Ken was asking me questions, we don't necessarily
15	focus on the technology; it's more the ease of
L6	distribution, the ease of consumption. Because
17	technology is a thing that changes on a day-to-day
18	basis.
19	Q I understand. And you mentioned that even
20	when Sony has hired skilled analysts to do projections
21	to help it figure out the future like Jupiter and
22	Forrester sometimes what you get isn't real useful;

1	isn't that right?
2	A Correct.
3	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Do you get a refund
4	in that case?
5	THE WITNESS: Do you get a refund from
6	your broker if your stocks go down?
7	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Unfortunately not.
8	BY MR. KIRBY:
9	Q And you don't know Sony doesn't
10	know for example what electronic viruses bin Laden
11	may have in store for us, does it?
12	A No. If we did, I'm sure somebody from the
13	FBI would have called me.
14	Q My point is simply this; that if this
15	group tries to set rates based on projections as to
16	what's going to be happening in this industry two
17	years or five years or seven years out, it's going to
18	be telling a fairy story, isn't it?
19	A No. I think that you kind of need to look
20	at where the wind is blowing, look at what this media
21	is about. And if you try to base all of the
22	methods of distribution and consumption in this media

1	are very different than they are to the analog world.
2	And if you base the value of all this on the analog
3	world, and say, well, today we think that this is all
4	promotional and it's helping sell physical goods, so
5	let's establish something based on that
6	assumption when all the science points to the fact
7	that that is starting to change, personally I would
8	feel that that would be short-sighted.
9	Q But on the other hand
10	A And I would also say that if by the
11	very fact that webcasters and terrestrial stations are
12	playing in this space, they clearly demonstrate that
13	they believe that there is value in this new media and
14	that the space is changing.
15	Q That wasn't my question. But my question
16	was, to the extent they try to really make any
17	five-year or seven-year projections as to what
18	technology's going to be transmitting, at what bit
19	rate, to what kind of receivers, over what percentage
20	of the country, there's just no way to know that kind
21	of stuff right now, is there?
22	A No, I think that there are absolutes in

I	
1	it.
2	(Whereupon, at 11:07 a.m., the proceedings
3	went into Closed Session.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

BY MR. KIRBY: 1 Now, you talked about Sony focusing its Q 2 promotional efforts on current music and on particular 3 tracks from current albums; is that right? 4 That's part of what we do. 5 Α 6 And those are the tracks and those are the 7 albums where Sony really hopes to make its money, right? 8 9 Those are -- when we have new artists that are going to pop and sell millions and millions of 10 11 records, it is not -- it's a rare thing when something 12 that was released 20 years ago comes out of nowhere and sells 20 million records. 13 That being said, we 14 have a department called Legacy at Sony that spends a 15 lot of time going through the catalog and putting out reissues from time to time, and occasionally building 16 17 campaigns around things like Miles Davis' "Kind of Blue." We'll go back in. The engineers will get the 18 19 original master tape, reengineer it, come out with a 20 new marketing campaign about it. So I certainly wouldn't say that our 21

efforts are confined to newer products, but I will say

the lion share of our marketing efforts are geared 1 2 towards newer products. That's where you expect to make most of 3 4 your money; isn't that right? In times when, as I said, hits 5 Α 6 unpredictable, a past hit is predictable because you 7 know there's probably going to be an audience for it for an extended period of time. 8 So catalog in times 9 when a record company is cold keeps the lights on. So 10 we make a tremendous amount of money, obviously, from 11 catalog sales. 12 0 But you don't recruit bands and put out 13 CDs and the expectation, well, we're not going to sell 14 any in the 2000s, but come 2040, we'll have this in our catalog, and maybe some people will buy a few. 15 16 That's not the way the record industry works, is it? 17 We certainly hope that long-term artist development is an aspect of any artist that we break. 18 19 You hope that -- our catalog -- the Bruce Springsteen catalog -- I heard some folks talk about Bruce 20 21 Springsteen before. The Bruce Springsteen catalog 22 continues to make us a tremendous amount of money, and

1	it continues to make Bruce Springsteen a tremendous
2	amount of money, 20-30 years later.
3	Q I understand, and I'm jealous. But the
4	fact still remains, I think, that you have current
5	music from which you expect to make far and away most
6	of your money
7	A Correct.
8	Q and then you have this back catalog
9	stuff, and sometimes you get lucky. But I think it's
10	right that you don't recruit bands and have them make
11	CDs for the purpose of building up your back catalog,
12	do you?
13	A Not in and of itself because that would be
14	almost an impossible thing. You have to have the
15	artist be successful, at which point after the product
16	runs its life course, it goes into catalog, and then
17	it's a viable product. You have to have one before
18	you have the other.
19	Q And when you have the terrestrial radio
20	station that is playing your current music, the music
21	that you singled out to promote, Sony acknowledges it
22	gets substantial promotional benefit from that, right?

1	A For our physical goods, yes.
2	Q But at the same time that radio station is
3	using your current high-value music, right?
4	A Correct.
5	Q Now, when somebody's playing out of your
6	back catalog, Sony considers it gets far less
7	promotional value from that, right?
8	A We don't really focus on the promotion in
9	radio of that music, so, yeah, I would guess it would
10	be accurate statement to say it's a less promotional
11	value to it.
12	Q Okay. But at the same time it's less
13	valuable music at that point too, right?
14	A I wouldn't say that "Sergeant Pepper" is
15	less valuable than Britney Spears.
16	Q But there's always the exceptions. But
17	how many Sergeant Peppers do you have in your back
18	catalog?
19	A We have quite a few actually.
20	Q Really? Well, you're remarkably
21	fortunate.
22	A Sony has a really good catalog.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	Q Nonetheless, the fact of the matter is, if
2	you contrast the value of music that a station focused
3	on your current top hits is using compared to the
4	value of a station that's playing swing music, for
5	example, the station that's playing your current top
6	hits is using much more valuable music, isn't it?
7	A They're playing music that is a priority
8	for us at that moment in time, and it is important for
9	us for it to be a priority at that moment in time.
10	Q And it's making a great deal more money at
11	that
12	A Potentially, yes.
13	Q Okay. And the swing music, for example,
14	they're pulling out of your catalog and playing, if
15	you make money, that's great, but you're not promoting
16	that.
17	A The important thing I know it sounds
18	like I'm maybe being a little bit too detail, and I
19	apologize for that. But the important thing to kind
20	of understand about the catalog business in general is
21	that it costs us a tremendous amount of money to get
22	an artist off the ground and to make things

successful, make videos that cost a million dollars.

Once we've already done that and the record has been successful, and then it goes into catalog, there's very little maintenance that's required in order for that to continue to sell. Miles Davis' "Kind of Blue" will sell long after we in this room are all gone. And it will do so with very little maintenance and attention from us. So we make a tremendous amount of money from catalog. It is an extremely important part of our business. And our investment in it relative to the pop stuff -- the pop stuff is a high investment is a high investment to make it happen; the catalog stuff, we don't have to put a tremendous amount of money into it, and yet it generates a significant amount of revenue for us. That's why I'm answering the way I am.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Can I ask you related to this -- everything that we've been talking about is pop, and that's understandably a huge market. I happened Saturday after we adjourned to go a concert of Yo Yo Ma. And I noticed in the catalog that he was a Sony artist.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

How much promotion is there for non-pop, say the classical area, of somebody who sort of within that area is a star?

THE WITNESS: There is a tremendous amount of promotion that gets done, and actually it's -- in a lot of ways it's a lot harder work. Because we would never take Yo Yo Ma necessarily to MTV. Sometimes, let's say, if Yo Yo Ma did a set -- we've had sound tracks like for Crouching Tiger. Sony Classical did the sound track for that, and they did a remix, and they tried to get it played. But for the most part, MTV's not going to play Yo Yo Ma on TRL.

So an alternative marketing element comes into it where it becomes more lifestyle marketing. We think about what is the lifestyle of people who listen to Yo Yo Ma, and what places do they go to to get turned on to music. And those are the places we focus on. Obviously, that isn't mainstream radio or -- in some cases it may be mainstream media. Like there might be an article on Yo Yo Ma in "Time." But we do a tremendous amount.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: You then put an ad in

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

"Time"?

THE WITNESS: We may have put an ad in "Time." The problem is that usually because somebody like Yo Yo Ma sounds a lot -- smaller amount of records than someone like a Brittney Spears, the marketing budget for that project is appropriate to what we expect the sales to end up being. So a full-page printout in something like "Rolling Stone" is going to cost 25 or \$50,000. And out of the marketing budget that you have to spend on an artist, that's a significant portion to spend on one ad, let's say.

Jackson record is coming out, of course, you're going to do those kinds of things. For somebody like Yo Yo Ma, to spend that much money on one ad and one magazine that's on the shelves for a week probably wouldn't be good marketing. I would spend that money elsewhere for an artist like that, more lifestyle oriented marketing.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Do you happen to know sort of ballpark what are likely sort of maximum sales

in a year? Because we've gotten a lot of data from the top 100 album sales last year and things like that. Rough comparison, a relatively successful, classical artist, how many --

THE WITNESS: 20,000, 30,000. You occasionally have things -- anomalies -- where, let's say, if we do a -- one huge record for our industry was the Three Tenors' record a few years ago, had a PBS special behind it.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Was that Sony?

THE WITNESS: No, actually I think that was London Records actually. A Sony analogy would be a young lady named Charlotte Church. She had a record out called Voice of an Angel, and she's a 12-year-old opera singer. She's been in Washington and sang for the president -- well, for President Clinton. And that kind of a thing becomes a social phenomena. And you can point to those kind of things as being the pop hits of the classical world. But for every one of those there are probably one or 200 classical CDs that we might put out that have very small unit sales. As a matter of fact, the typical classical CD might sell

1	5,000 units.
2	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Do you happen to know
3	how many the Three Tenors sold?
4	THE WITNESS: Millions of records.
5	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: They sold millions.
6	THE WITNESS: Millions.
7	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: I see. And how about
8	Church?
9	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure whether
10	Charlotte went platinum, but I'm pretty sure she at
11	least went gold in the United States. I think there
12	might have been a platinum record.
13	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Gold is how many?
14	THE WITNESS: Five hundred thousand units,
15	sir. But she appeared on "Oprah." We record Chinese
16	symphonies, recording traditional Chinese repertoire,
17	and it's rare that those guys get on "Oprah" or get to
18	play for the president, or get a PBS special.
19	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Why wouldn't the
20	Internet, with all these genres where you have
21	specialized audiences collected, be a terrific
22	opportunity for selling some modest additional

amount -- Yo Yo Ma's not going to sell 6 million, but instead of 20,000, if he could sell 30 or 40, wouldn't that be nice? Or the jazz channels, where everybody, oh, they've redone the Miles Davis thing.

Why wouldn't those be ideal places for targeted promotion of these kinds of less -- not the pop top hit records, but you still got them, and it would be nice to increase their sales by 50 percent or 25 percent or 10 percent, I guess. There's some cheap advertising on these Web sites.

THE WITNESS: We'll get it all the time. You'll see it in the testimony. We try to get it all the time.

I think the key word in what you just said is "targeted." It is a viable place. I've spent the past eight years of my life trying to figure out ways to market on the Internet, but it has to be targeted. And when we're -- it's part of an overall approach to marketing an artist. The Internet in and of itself right now, we wouldn't solely place all our bets on doing a promotion just exclusively on the Internet, but Internet, particularly for those kinds of artists,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	are a really important part of the marketing of those
2	artists; but again, very targeted marketing.
3	BY MR. KIRBY:
4	Q Do you know the song it's a very dated
5	song at this point; it was long before you were in
6	junior high school "Shine Little Glow Worm, Glimmer
7	Glimmer"?
8	A I think I might have sang it when I was at
9	camp when I was younger.
10	Q Okay. My daughter, who's in college right
11	now, recently sought out and purchased the CD that has
12	that song on it.
13	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: It's by the Mills
14	Brothers.
15	MR. KIRBY: It's actually a number of
16	them.
17	Would you care to guess what triggered her
18	doing that?
19	THE WITNESS: I would for a betting
20	man, I'd say you were going to tell me Internet radio.
21	MR. KIRBY: This is a very wise man. She
22	heard it. And if you don't hear music, you're not
1	

very likely to buy it, are you? 1 2 THE WITNESS: I'd say that's a safe assumption. 3 BY MR. KIRBY: 4 5 So with all this catalog of music Q that Sony and the other record companies have out 6 7 there, putting aside the current stuff that you're promoting, putting aside the compilations that your 8 9 Heritage division puts together from time to time, if people to buying 10 going be from that are catalog -- particular, younger people that are coming 11 12 up, who weren't around when the Mills Brothers were singing "Shine Little Glow Worm" early on, if those 13 14 catalogs are going to have sales, it's going to be 15 because somebody out there is playing that music so 16 that new listeners are hearing that music; isn't that 17 right? 18 Α That's probably a pretty safe assumption. 19 MR. KIRBY: That's all I have. 20 CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Now, your counsel gets a chance to ask you additional questions, if they 21

would like to.

1	MR. NEWBERG: We'd actually like to take,
2	if we could, a 10-minute break credited against our
3	time, obviously, before we go into redirect.
4	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Okay. Before we do
5	that, just to report, I'm assuming we have not had any
6	luck reaching Wolfgang Spegg.
7	MR. GARRETT: I think that is correct,
8	Your Honor. Sorry.
9	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: No problem.
10	MR. GARRETT: I should say that there was
11	a message that was left for him, and to the best of my
12	knowledge, he's not returned it.
13	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: We still have a very
14	easily budgeted time, afternoon, so it shouldn't be a
15	difficulty.
16	Okay. A 10-minute break credited against
17	Mr. Harding.
18	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
19	the record at 11:24 a.m. and went back on
20	the record at 11:46 a.m.)
21	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: After deliberation,
22	have you all decided that you do have some

1	MR. NEWBERG: We have just a few
2	questions.
3	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. NEWBERG:
5	Q Mr. McDermott, you said Sony started
6	selling downloads in April 2000. Were you already
7	doing one-off agreements for downloads and on-demand
8	streaming at that time?
9	A Yes. I started when I began at Sony,
10	we did a gigantic Mariah Carey promotion, streaming
11	her new single with Microsoft in August of 1999. And
12	I've done stuff all through my career prior to being
13	at Sony as well.
14	Q And you've done those agreements with
15	companies like the companies with whom you submitted
16	agreements as exhibits, like MTV and Launch?
17	A Yes.
18	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Are you responsible
19	for the fact that this month's "Architecture Digest"
20	has a big spread on Mariah Carey's new house?
21	THE WITNESS: No, sir. I cannot claim to
22	be responsible for that.

1	MR. STEINTHAL: Maybe indirectly.
2	THE WITNESS: She's actually on Virgin
3	Records now; so she's no longer a Sony artist.
4	BY MR. NEWBERG:
5	Q You also talked earlier about servicing.
6	Does all servicing mean giving free records?
7	A No. We actually have a wholesale price.
8	I don't know exactly how it works, but I know that
9	where there have been requests for servicing there's
LO	a blue-sheet rate or something that we'll refer folks
L1	to the distribution people to actually buy records.
12	Q And they buy them at a discounted price?
L3	A They buy them at a discounted price
L4	relative to retail, yeah. They have that ability.
L5	Q And that's also considered servicing.
L6	A Yes.
L7	Q You were asked earlier by Mr. Steinthal if
L8	you had any data that webcasters functions are not
L9	promotional. I assume in your experience you've
20	personally heard webcasters tell you that their
21	functions are promotional.
22	A Yes.

1	Q Has any webcaster ever presented you with
2	any data proving that these functions are promotional?
3	A No.
4	Q You also talked earlier about the future
5	of the industry and sales on the Internet, and your
6	views on that. Were you limiting your views to
7	downloads only when you talked about the future of
8	sales of music on the Internet?
9	A I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?
10	Q When you talked about the future of sales
11	on the Internet, were you limiting your answer to
12	downloads?
13	A Oh absolutely not. I think downloads is
14	kind of the dumbest type of a product that we could
15	sell over the Web. I think it's more about access,
16	it's more about the ease of distribution, portability.
17	So a download is analogous almost to a physical good,
18	it's transfer of ownership. That certainly will be in
19	our suite of products that we would offer at some
20	point, but I think increased access, conditional
21	access all of those type of models are a lot more
22	exciting than a one-for-one nurchage experience

1	Q And how does DMCA webcasting fit into your
2	view of the Sony revenue stream?
	_
3	A Well, I think that it's a it can be
4	very it can be very compelling to a user to have
5	very niche-oriented programming in particular.
6	I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?
7	Q Sure. How do you view DCMA webcasting as
8	part of Sony's revenue stream?
9	A Well, it's the answer that I had just
10	given about the fact that we have new types of
11	distribution, new consumption models, as we move away
12	from the physical good. It's a pleasing experience
13	for a listener to be able to go on and listen to all
14	sorts of different types of channels in an aggregated
15	location, and listen to vary narrow niches. And that
16	could be traditional pop kind of radio or it could be
17	the banjo music channel.
18	But being able to have this wealth of
19	content sitting there that is on all the time and
20	isn't as narrow as traditional radio is something that
21	we think is going to be very appealing to consumers.
22	And as a result, there's a chance to monetize that.

1.	Q And does Sony view this monetizing of DMCA
2	webcasting as just an ancillary part of its revenue
3	stream?
4	A No. I would say that, generally, access
5	to music, the distribution of music digitally and the
6	various consumption models are what our business is
7	going to be about. As I mentioned earlier about the
8	physical goods starting to go away, physical good has
9	a lot of limitations to it. If you've got a 500-CD
10	collection, and you want to go out to your car, cars
11	have six CD changers, when you're able to, actually,
12	to just listen to this wealth of stuff, it becomes
13	very compelling. The change of the physical good, of
14	the portability, of the accessibility start to vanish.
15	And I think that that will be very appealing to
16	consumers, and as a result, the physical good will
17	take a hit.
18	Q And have you already started seeing some
19	of that?
20	A I think so. I think the fact
21	that certainly, a tremendous amount of people
22	used an unbelievable amount of people use Napster.

I think that our sales this year have been flat. And as I mentioned earlier, the markets particularly outside the United States have seen a tremendous decrease in sales, and they think it's tied into CD burning and general online consumption of music. So it's starting. It's an opportunity. If you looked at it just as a threat, that would be in appropriate. There's an opportunity there, clearly.

Q You talked about data before, showing what

Q You talked about data before, showing what webcasters sold in clickthroughs. Do you actually get routine reports from Amazon telling you how many clickthroughs came from webcasters?

Α No. They'll speak anecdotally sometimes when they're making pitches about how successful various promotions are, but in terms of providing detailed reports about those kinds of things, the nature of their agreements with the people that have those relationships with them would preclude them from providing me with that information, unless the webcaster consented to that information being provided.

Q And have individual webcasters ever given

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	you this information?
2	A No, because I don't think I think they
3	realize it wouldn't be particularly thrilling.
4	Q
5	MR. KIRBY: If it was worth it, I would
6	object to that speculation.
7	MR. NEWBERG: I think that's all we have.
8	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Anything on recross?
9	MR. STEINTHAL: I have a couple of
10	questions generated from that discussion.
11	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. STEINTHAL:
13	Q First of all, I take it the Pearl Jam
14	promotion in which there were only
15	MR. STEINTHAL: I don't think I'm going to
16	go anywhere near where we need to go on restricted.
17	You gave a number of units, if you will, that were
18	sold as a result of the Pearl Jam promotion. You
19	don't have to repeat what that number is. It would be
20	a fair statement, wouldn't it, that in all the
21	promotions, including the Mariah Carey promotion that
22	you've done on the Internet, there have been many that

have resulted in clickthrough sales of a lot greater than the Pearl Jam promotion that you referenced.

THE WITNESS: No. Clickthrough sales as a general statement are the last thing that I want to look at as being the real value behind any of these promotions because they're always the typically meager sales.

## BY MR. STEINTHAL:

Q But you're not going to sit here and testify that the Pearl Jam number is a number that hasn't been exceeded.

A No, it's been exceeded in different cases. But I would say that, generally, in terms of the kind of numbers that I would expect to get a record label excited about, these kind of numbers have fallen far short of that. And, again, I've asked every webcaster that I've ever met with in any meeting to provide me with a single example, anecdotal example, of an aggressive, successful clickthrough, or sales as a result of a promotion via these links. And I must have asked the question 50 or 60 times over the past few years, and I've never had a single occasion where

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I was given a concrete example of a successful sale as 1 a result of clickthroughs. 2 3 ARBITRATOR VON KANN: But you keep doing it. 4 THE WITNESS: It doesn't hurt. That's the 5 great thing about it. All you've got to do is put a 6 7 link there. It's really -- it's -- it doesn't hurt. 8 BY MR. STEINTHAL: 9 And the value of the promotion is often 10 much more that whatever the limited clickthrough might be because it sends people to the artist site, it 11 12 sends people to Sony's site, it interests people in 13 the music, the new music being offered; isn't that right? 14 15 Α That's correct, but the process by which 16 we get all that is a negotiation, and we have to sit down and say what we want. And as you can see, each 17 18 of these end up turning into an agreement in order for 19 us to get that value, to extract that value. general rule of thumb, when things get played on 20 21 Spinner, I don't get all of those things for every one 22 of my records that get played on a station like

Spinner.

1.2

Q Now, you talked about these targeted promotions, and you talked about the fact that they are targeted. And that was, I believe, in response to either counsel's or one of the panel's questions. You made a big point of the promotions being targeted.

Let me ask you this. I take it that when, for example, the targeted promotion is an MTV promotion, it's often of an artist whose very works are being played on the webcasting service that MTV has, right?

A Yes. And as a matter of fact, what we try to do is leverage the online visibility with offline visibility. And we will ask for in-kind bartering. If we give a stream to MTV, typically we ask them to run advertisements or crawls along the bottom of the screen which actually announce that. And we can very accurately look at what the monetization of that might be. If we wanted to buy 30-second spots on MTV to run nationally, we have a rate. We know very clearly what the value of that is, and we fight very hard to get significant border on air for things we do on the Web

site. 1 And it is true as well, is it not, that, 2 Q 3 typically, MTVi or Spinner, for example, to the extent 4 they're doing a promotion with you, are going to be 5 doing promotions of artists whose works are included 6 on their webcast radio stations as well, right? 7 Sometimes, but if you look at stuff like Α the top 100 greatest soul hits, whatever, it's not 8 9 very reflective of what the repertoire they're currently playing on VH-1 would be. 10 11 Of course, because that particular station is a catalog station; it's not a new artist station. 12 13 But when they do a promotion for Ricky Martin --14 MTV would be a pure example of what you're 15 trying to say, yes. 16 Now you mentioned the n-word, so I have to 17 come back to it, that being the Napster word, in response to counsel's questions. You are familiar 18 19 with the fact that Napster, of course, delivered to people using it CD-quality possession of files of 20 music that they could put into portable players and 21 22 the like, right?

1	A I would agree with everything except for
2	your comment that it is CD quality. CD quality is
3	1644 redbook audio. A 128K compressed MP3 file is not
4	CD quality.
5	Q But people using Napster get the 128K as
6	opposed to the 16 or 32 kilobit screen, right?
7	A Correct.
8	Q And you would agree with me that the
9	experience in terms of potential displacement of
10	having physical possession of the music file at
11	128 kilobits is very different than the streaming
1.2	experience.
13	A Yes.
14	MR. STEINTHAL: I've nothing else.
15	MR. KIRBY: Very briefly.
16	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. KIRBY:
1.8	Q You mentioned the blue sheet. And if I
19	understood what you said, if I'm a webcaster, and I
20	call up and ask to get service, Sony's likely to tell
21	me know, we won't give you CDs, but call over here and
22	take a look at our blue-sheet prices; is that what you

said? 1 If we felt like someone was an appropriate 2 Α 3 promotional partner, then, yes, there's an ability to 4 buy product from us at a reduce price point than going 5 into retail. But as I mentioned also, I don't 6 personally handle those transactions, so I can only 7 speak in very vague terms about how that works. 8 Q Since it's come up, do you know? Is there 9 actually a blue sheet or at least a sheet regardless of what the color is these days? 10 11 I think that's the moniker that is used 12 for servicing of people who want to buy product from 13 us. Does it refer to the fact that there are 14 0 15 prices available? When this happens, they don't sit 16 down and negotiate one by one by one the price of these sheets? 17 It's a reduced as a wholesale price. 1.8 Α 19 And, actually, it is geared towards instead of someone 20 having to go out and spend 15 or 16.98 on every CD

they want to buy, there's a reduce price at which they

can buy CDs. And that's an incentive, obviously, for

21

1	them to purchase from us.
2	Q Right. Is it your impression that at
3	least some webcasters are able to get CDs at the
4	blue-sheet price?
5	A If they asked to if they wanted to buy
6	them from us, yeah, that is my impression. I guess
7	the question is whether or not it seems like some
8	folks that we've met with wanted to just get
9	everything for free. And if you say, well, you can
10	get a greatly reduced price versus retail, some might
11	find that a compelling option and some might think,
1.2	no, I should just get it for free.
13	Q Right. Oh, I understand that there are
14	people in this industry who would like to get things
15	for free. But still, if I understood what you said,
16	you believe webcasters, if I was going to do an
17	Internet streaming program, and I came to Sony, and
18	Sony concluded it didn't just want to give me the CDs,
19	Sony might very well refer me to the blue-sheet
20	prices; is that right?
21	A Yeah.
22	Q Or the prices would be greatly reduced; is

1.	that right?
2	A Yes.
3	Q And that's because of the promotional
4	value of what I would be doing, right?
5	A It's because it's basically because, if
6	someone's starting a business where they're going to
7	be playing our records, and we come up with a
8	licensing agreement with them, and we want to make it
9	easier for them to get into this space and actually
10	build a business, they need our music to do so. So
11	what we're doing is giving them making it easier
12	for them to do that.
13	Whether or not we could certainly just
14	say, we'll go buy them at a store, but I think that
15	what we're doing is making it easier for somebody who
16	wants to get into a new business. We're lowering the
17	cost of entry. I don't think there's any real
18	ulterior motive to it or recognition under some other
19	fact.
20	MR. KIRBY: That's all I have.
21	MR. NEWBERG: I just have one question.
22	REDIRECT EXAMINATION

1	BY MR. NEWBERG:
2	Q Mr. McDermott, was I correct, just that I
3	heard you correctly? The only time a webcaster would
4	get blue-sheet prices is if you already decided that
5	they would be an adequate promotional partner for you
6	on other things?
7	A Yes.
8	MR. NEWBERG: That's all I have.
9	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Thank you all.
10	Thank you very much for making the trip
11	down and for lasting through all this water and the
12	rest. This is I guess Poland Springs water torture.
13	We'll stand adjourned 'til 1:30 then.
14	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
15	the record from 12:03 p.m. until 1:34 a.m.)
16	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Welcome. We're
17	delighted to have you here. Please take a seat.
18	Thanks, in part, to you, and thanks, in part, to our
19	witnesses this morning. I think this is week nine of
20	our hearings. This is the first day we've ever gotter
21	more than an hour for lunch, so this is a day to
22	celebrate.

1	We very much appreciate your coming and
2	willing to be with us today to answer some of the
3	panel's questions about the agreement that you entered
4	into. Let me ask you to raise your right hand to be
5	sworn in, please, by our court reporter.
6	Whereupon,
7	WOLFGANG SPEGG
8	was called as a witness, and, having first been duly
9	sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
10	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: For the public record,
11	could you state and spell your name, pleas?
12	THE WITNESS: My name is Wolfgang Spegg.
13	First name is W-o-l-f-g-a-n-g, and last name is
14	S-p-e-g-g.
15	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Great. And could you
16	give us the name of your company and your position in
17	it?
18	THE WITNESS: I'm president and CEO of
19	Musicmusic, Inc.
20	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Excellent. As we said
21	in our letter of invitation to you, we have received
22	a good deal of information about how Musicmusic

1	works, and there were a group of questions which we as
2	a panel wanted to ask you. And then in addition,
3	there will be an opportunity for the lawyers from each
4	side in this proceeding to ask you their questions as
5	well.
6	THE WITNESS: I'll be happy to answer
7	anything asked.
8	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Judge Gulin, would you
9	pose some questions for us, please?
10	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Sure.
11	Hello again, Mr. Spegg. And as the chair
12	indicated, I'll be asking a few general questions, and
13	then the attorneys will probably want to get into some
14	more specifics.
15	Let me start by asking you, when did your
16	service launch?
17	THE WITNESS: We launched on Christmas
18	Day, December 25, 1997.
19	ARBITRATOR GULIN: And I take it you're
20	still operating?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes, we're still operating,
22	one of the few, I guess.

1	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Now, you first entered
2	into an agreement with the RIAA. I believe that was
3	I guess a couple years into your operation. Was it
4	April of '99 when you entered into an agreement with
5	them?
6	THE WITNESS: You know, I don't know the
7	exact date, but it was in the spring of '99. We had
8	actually applied for the license long before that,
9	before the DMCA got passed.
10	ARBITRATOR GULIN: When you say you
11	applied for the license, you mean you had sent notice
12	into
13	THE WITNESS: We approached the RIAA, and
14	we asked them to license what we were doing.
15	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. And you entered
16	into an agreement with the RIAA, and that agreement
17	ran for a period of time, and then that initial
18	agreement expired, correct?
19	THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.
20	ARBITRATOR GULIN: And so you entered into
21	I guess negotiations to renew the agreement.
22	THE WITNESS: Yes. And we renewed that

1	late last year.
2	ARBITRATOR GULIN: And that agreement that
3	you're operating under now, if my information is
4	correct, runs from the period of March of '01 through
5	the end of next year, the end of '02.
6	THE WITNESS: That is correct, I believe,
7	yes.
8	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Now, when you first
9	entered into the agreement with RIAA, again, if my
10	understanding is correct, you offered a functionality
11	that was known as I'm the DJ.
12	THE WITNESS: That is one of the many
13	functionalities that our Web site offers.
L4	ARBITRATOR GULIN: It still offers that,
15	I'm the DJ?
L6	THE WITNESS: Yes, it does. But let me
17	explain that we operate we abide by the DMCA under
18	those recordings that we license through the RIAA, and
19	we offer some very interactive services with tracks
20	that we license directly through some of the record
21	companies, many of the independents. And now we are
22	starting to get licensed by the majors as well for

interactivity.

1.4

ARBITRATOR GULIN: With respect to the license agreement with RIAA that was for DMCA-compliant services, is it true that the RIAA had some concerns concerning this functionality known as I'm the DJ?

THE WITNESS: We went through a long period of negotiation with the RIAA, and we had a number of our services that needed to be restricted or altered. And when -- a matter of fact, we started working on coding on software the same month that the DMCA got passed, which was October 1998, to make sure that our software -- made sure that each stream abided with the DMCA rules.

It is a little bit difficult to tell from our site exactly what we do because any one user can have a mix of tunes that must abide by the DMCA and tunes that do not have to abide by the DMCA. We control our database by having a software switch on each track. It is a DMCA track or a non-DMCA track. So, therefore, when a user decides to create their own show like in the I am the DJ service, they can only

1	choose from the non-DMCA tracks, which includes over
2	100 independent labels.
3	So to really know what's going on, you
4	must really know every single track and who it belongs
5	to is it controlled by one of the majors or is it
6	controlled by one of the independent labels that
7	signed on an interactive agreement with us.
8	ARBITRATOR GULIN: So is it fair to say,
9	then, that the I'm the DJ functionality is not now
10	part of the DMCA-compliant
11	THE WITNESS: That is correct.
12	ARBITRATOR GULIN: agreement you have
13	with the RIAA?
14	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
15	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Now, at the time that
16	you entered into the agreement, and you were operating
17	already, did you have a song skip function?
18	THE WITNESS: At the time that we entered
19	it, we already had taken sorry. The skip function
20	is still there; however, the backwards skip function
21	is not there. And that was the request made by Steven
22	Marks of the RIAA, that we cannot allow them to go

backwards and replay the same song, but we can skip it and go on to the next song.

ARBITRATOR GULIN: As far as the forward skipping function, you had that at the time you entered into the agreement, and you continue to have that as part of your DMCA-compliant --

THE WITNESS: That is correct, yes.

ARBITRATOR GULIN: Are there any limitations on that skip function with respect from the users perspective? If I'm a listener to your service and I want to use that skip function, are there any limitations as to how often I can use it, or how many times I can push the button, or anything along those lines?

THE WITNESS: No, but maybe again I should explain a little bit. We do -- we stream differently than 99.9 percent of the services out there, and that we unicast. So when a user first decides to play a particular show -- let's call it a show; some of the services call it channels, but we're not like them -- at the time that he clicks that mouse on that show, our system creates a unique and randomized

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

playlist from a much larger basket of tracks that will run for up to 50 songs long. Should the user stop that show and start it again, a completely different and, again, unique and randomized list of songs is created for that playlist. The user can skip, and can skip a song anytime that they wish to.

ARBITRATOR GULIN: When the user presses

ARBITRATOR GULIN: When the user presses the skip button, though, that doesn't create an entirely new 50-song list?

THE WITNESS: No. When that list is created -- and let's say it's list а 50 tracks -- it will go from Track 1 through 50. The user does not know which track is coming next. is strictly for internal control. Each song is a URL, our software points to where that URL is. Sometimes when that URL is corrupt that it doesn't exist, the system will skip it all by itself. But the user can skip once a song has started, and it will go on to the next song.

ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. Under the DMCA, as I understand it, you're not permitted to have more than two consecutive songs from the same album to the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

listener.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE WITNESS: The way I understand it is you're not allowed to have more than two songs of a particular artist in a row. You're not allowed to have more than three songs off a particular album or off a particular artist in a show. And there are many other rules and regulations that are in there. And know, Ι did not do the programming; programming team did that. And we have written the software so that to test against each and every one of these rules and regulations, and make sure that that particular stream abides by it.

ARBITRATOR GULIN: And you may not be able to really answer more fully than that. But if, for example, there were three songs, is it possible that there could be three songs from a particular album in one playlist?

THE WITNESS: It is possible. It is very highly unlikely because of the randomization feature, but it is possible. Our relational database is built such a way that every track is related to an album or more than one album, because when you have a "best of"

album, of course it's related to more than one album. 1 And it tests every single one of these occurrences and 2 3 makes sure there's not more than three of one album. ARBITRATOR GULIN: So it's possible but 4 5 highly unlikely. Let's for a moment assume that it 6 does happen, that there are three tracks from a given 7 album within the playlist. And as a user, I use my 8 skip function so that, to me, I get to hear three consecutive tracks on the same album by using the skip 9 function. They weren't programmed that way, but I had 10 11 to use my skip function to do that. Under those circumstances, I take it you 12 13 feel that the services still comply. 14 Well, I think THE WITNESS: it 15 impossible for you to do that because you would have 16 to listen to the beginning of the next song to find out whether it is from the same artist or the same 17 18 So you will at least get a snippet of other album. 19 songs in between. 20 ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. That's correct. And would it be that fact that you would rely upon to 21 22 say that there weren't really three consecutive

1	tracks?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes, I would, yeah.
3	ARBITRATOR GULIN: So just for the
4	record I'm sure I know the answer you feel your
5	skip function is DMCA-compliant?
6	THE WITNESS: Well, we feel it does. And
7	let me also say that we it is our intention to push
8	the envelope on each and every one of these rules and
9	regulations of the DMCA but to totally abide by them.
10	The reason why we want to push the envelope is because
11	we want to make the experience as enjoyable to the
12	listener as possible.
13	ARBITRATOR GULIN: At this time,
14	Mr. Chair, I think we need to go into restricted
15	session.
16	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Okay. Please mark
17	that on the record.
18	This is a procedure which we use very
19	regularly in order to ask questions about business
20	elements or things that are not part of the public
21	information. And only people who are appropriate,
22	have access to restricted material, can be present and

1	listen. And in the transcripts that are filed
2	publicly and available to the public through the
3	Library of Congress, the part that we're now going to
4	do will not be made available to the public. So it's
5	to protect your business interest while at the same
6	time giving us as much information as we can to be
7	able to make a reasonable decision.
8	(Whereupon, at 1:48 p.m., the proceedings
9	went into Closed Session.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: This is open session, I hope. Yes, open. Mr. Katz?

MR. KATZ: I was saying that I was alerted

during the break to a protective order issue relating to this Witness. The Panel may remember during Mr. Marks' examination that he indicated that long after the streaming audio service, about which the Witness is going to testify, discontinued. Mr. Purcell was signed on by the RIAA as a consultant.

In that role as a consultant, he did execute the protective order in this case, and certain confidential materials were disclosed to him, confidential materials which have nothing to do with his testimony today. At that point, he did execute the exhibit to the protective order, but under the terms of the protective order we were not required to serve that on opposing counsel until it became clear that he was going to be a witness.

Well, it really didn't occur to us that he was, as a consultant, going to be appearing as a witness, because the Panel invited all licensees to appear. But a technical instruction could indicate

that that was required, so we are getting copies of
the certification and will provide it to opposing
counsel. I don't think that this would be a violation
of the protective order, but I apologize for our delay
in providing those.
MR. STEINTHAL: Can we understand what
confidential information the Witness has reviewed?
MR. SIGALL: He was provided with the cost
information that the webcaster witnesses provided in
their written testimony in the direct case.
ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: From the direct
case.
ARBITRATOR VON KANN: I think that I
remember
MR. STEINTHAL: Well, we knew he had been
designated
ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Dr. Nagle
testifying, as a matter of fact, to Mr. Purcell's
review of some of that stuff and some of the
consultations that he had with him, I believe.
MR. STEINTHAL: I think he disclosed that
he had had conversations with him about the business.

I didn't know that he had reviewed specific financial 1 information from our client. 2 3 MR. SIGALL: I think Mr. Marks testified to that, in fact, as to what his role --4 5 ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: That's my memory as 6 well. 7 ARBITRATOR VON KANN: ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: 8 So I think we have a situation where we're probably in line with the 9 10 spirit and not necessarily the timeliness of the 11 letter, but nonetheless in a position where we're 12 appropriate to proceed. 13 Thank you. MR. KATZ: 14 ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: Mr. Purcell, first, 15 let us thank you for coming, for making this trip and 16 with apologies that we're running behind in our 17 schedule today, and we appreciate your forbearance. 18 We're going to do everything we can to be as focused 19 and crisp in our questions so as not to run you any further later than necessary. We appreciate you 20 21 coming. I need to ask you to raise your right hand to

be sworn in by the court reporter.

1	WHEREUPON,
2	SCOTT PURCELL
3	was called as a witness by the CARP Panel, having
4	first been duly sworn, assumed the witness stand, was
5	examined and testified as follows:
6	ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: And for the record,
7	would you please say and spell your name?
8	THE WITNESS: Scott Purcell, S-C-O-T-T P-
9	U-R-C-E-L-L.
10	ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: And your position
11	and the name of the company about which you're going
12	to testify with the agreement.
13	THE WITNESS: With the agreement. I was
14	the Founder and CEO of OnAir Streaming Networks,
15	Incorporated.
16	ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: And my colleague,
17	Judge Gulin, has a few questions to ask on behalf of
18	us as a Panel.
19	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Good afternoon again,
20	Mr. Purcell. The name of the service is OnAir.com
21	that you offer?
22	THE WITNESS: The name of the Company was

1	OnAir Streaming Networks. The URL or domain was
2	OnAir.com, and we were commonly just called OnAir in
3	the marketplace.
4	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. And was that the
5	same company that was formerly WWW.com?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes.
7	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. When did that
8	change occur?
9	THE WITNESS: We changed the name of that
10	company in December time period of 1999, I believe,
11	maybe a little bit earlier than that, in order to
12	better clarify to the marketplace what we were doing,
13	what we were all about.
14	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. So when did you
15	launch well, let's start with WWW.com.
16	THE WITNESS: Sure.
17	ARBITRATOR GULIN: When did you launch
18	that?
19	THE WITNESS: The Company was incorporated
20	in October of 1998, and we spent some time building
21	the business models and the infrastructure and the
22	technology that we would need through the summer of

'99 when we acquired a small music streaming company 1 in Los Angeles and used that as some of the base for 2. 3 what we eventually built. We actually began streaming in the late third, early fourth quarter of that year. 4 5 ARBITRATOR GULIN: And was that kind of a 6 vanilla flavor of webcasting operation? There were no 7 special functionalities like song skipping and --THE WITNESS: No special functionalities, 8 9 just basic station broadcasting. By station I mean 10 our programmers were creating the genres of music that 11 people could listen to. 12 ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. There was no rating function and no skip song function. 13 14 THE WITNESS: No. We did not -- in the 15 initial phase, we did not incorporate a skip song. By 16 the time we began thinking about what we really wanted 17 to do, we found out what was and what was not 18 permissible by the RIAA, and then decided we couldn't 19 do it. The rating function, we preferred to just have more direct feedback with our DJs than have actual 20 21 some sort of a rating deal.

ARBITRATOR GULIN:

22

And was WWW.com a

1	syndicator?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes. Well, OnAir and WW,
3	same Company.
4	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Same Company, right.
5	Nothing changed in December of '99 when you became
6	OnAir.com.
7	THE WITNESS: Only the name.
8	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Only the name.
9	THE WITNESS: Only the name. I bought the
10	domain, OnAir.com, and changed the name of the
11	Company.
12	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. You ultimately
13	entered into an agreement with RIAA. Was that around
14	January of 2000?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, December/January.
16	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. And when did you
17	begin streaming under that agreement?
18	THE WITNESS: Well, we had been streaming
19	already, and we actually wound up writing them a check
20	for some back what we had already streamed. So, in
21	theory, we had been streaming under that agreement
22	4

ARBITRATOR GULIN: Do you remember what 1 the term was for that agreement, what time period it 2 3 covered? I believe it was till 4 THE WITNESS: 5 December 31st of 2000. It was supposed to be in parallel with the arbitration proceedings. 6 7 ARBITRATOR GULIN: So it was retroactive 8 back to '98? 9 When I signed it in -- yes, THE WITNESS: retroactive to whenever we had started 10 was 11 streaming. We didn't stream in '98. 12 ARBITRATOR GULIN: Okay. 13 ARBITRATOR VAN LOON: Part of the 14 framework under which we've received testimony has 15 been in restricted session so that business elements, elements of agreement would not be known to the public 16 17 at large and the transcripts from the portion of the 18 period when it's in restricted session are not made public by the Library of Congress the way that all of 19 And so we would like to go into the others are. 20 21 restricted session at this point to ask specific

questions about the terms of your agreement.

Т				(wne	reupon,	at	4:40	p.m.,	tne	proce	eain	.gs
2	We	ent	into	Closed	Sessio	n.)						
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												
21												
22												

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Before we start with this witness, I understand there's an additional administrative matter with Mr. Garrett.

MR. GARRETT: Mr. Chairman, we had mentioned last week that we wanted to have Mr. Marks testify concerning certain matters raised during the Mandelbrot testimony and in connection with that we had submitted a version of Mr. Mandelbrot's testimony back to Mr. Greenstein and asked that he go through it and make certain that all of the things that we deleted were agreeable to him and that there wasn't anything else that he wanted to have deleted.

He received the material on Thursday and as I understand it, he immediately it forwarded it over to the people at Yahoo!, Mr. Greenstein, and I spoke with him earlier this morning. He had not heard back yet from his client about our proposals and I have not heard back from Mr. Greenstein throughout the course of the day here. So as of this moment, we still do not have an agreement with Mr. Greenstein about exactly what form we can show the testimony to Mr. Marks. And because I also do not have a modus

1	that I can provide to the other side here as to the
2	subjects in which Mr. Mark would testify, but I mean
3	I understand they want their notice and I would like
4	to get this thing wrapped up with Mr. Greenstein, but
5	it's all dependent upon Yahoo! finally clearing it.
6	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: How much material,
7	how large a volume of transcript pages or whatever did
8	you give Mr. Greenstein and ask that you be able to
9	show to Mr. Marks?
10	MR. GARRETT: I don't remember the exact
11	number of pages. Half of that, of course, there
12	should be no issue since the other, good Mr.
13	Greenstein was present.
14	(Laughter.)
15	And so it was really just the deletions on
16	the other part where we tried to at least allow the
17	folks at RIAA to see how Mr. Mandelbrot had
18	characterized RIAA's positions, RIAA's motivations,
19	that sort of thing.
20	MR. STEINTHAL: Just in case the other Mr.
21	Greenstein gets to read this, I'd like to object to
22	the characterization of the good and the bad

Greensteins. 1 MR. GARRETT: Mr. Greenstein knows how I 2 referred to him in the last CARP proceeding. 3 (Laughter.) 4 5 ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Is there anything 6 that we could do or could we ask that additional calls 7 be made from all sides? MR. GARRETT: I was hoping, I did not have 8 9 a proposal and I hope not to have to involve you and I just want to report where we are here. I think the 10 immediate issue is they want the other side here wants 11 12 its notice of what it is we are going to testify to 13 and --14 MR. STEINTHAL: Perhaps you can assume 15 that it's going to be okay, although I obviously have 16 no idea, have had no communication with Mr. Greenstein 17 about this at all, but at least you could notify me based on what you've given him and then it ain't going 18 19 to be any larger universe, so that way I'll have the 20 notice that I need. 21 MR. GARRETT: I can do that. We can 22 probably get something to you later this evening.

1	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: That sounds like a
2	good resolution.
3	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: That takes care of
4	half the problem. The other half is if it's all quite
5	on the Greenstein front and you are running up against
6	deadlines with Marks, which I assume you probably are
7	since he's due here Wednesday.
8	MR. GARRETT: That is the other problem.
9	MR. STEINTHAL: Can I just suggest in
10	light of the witness's late hour that we deal with the
11	administrative stuff after we're done with Mr.
12	Heilbronn?
13	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: I think that would
14	fair it wasn't going to take more than 30 seconds.
15	Our ruling is that we ask that you communicate to Mr.
16	Greenstein that if we haven't heard by noon from
17	tomorrow of specific problems, we're going to assume
18	that this is agreed to and go forward on that basis.
19	MR. GARRETT: I will so communicate that
20	to him now. Thank you very much.
21	MR. STEINTHAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: You're welcome. And

1	thank you very much, Mr. Heilbronn for being with us
2	and with sincere apologies that we've run later and
3	later and we are still are all very mindful of the
4	6:30 target and we think we're going to do everything
5	humanly possible and think we'll be able to liberate
6	you for your other meeting scheduled later this
7	evening.
8	Let me ask you first, please, to raise
9	your hand to be sworn in by our Court Reporter.
10	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Could you please state
11	and spell your name for our record?
12	THE WITNESS: John Heilbronn, last name is
13	spelled H-E-I-L-B-R-O-N-N.
14	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: And if you would give
15	the name of your company and the title, your title?
16	THE WITNESS: I am the President of
17	Cablemusic Networks, Incorporated, a San Diego
18	corporation.
19	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: As you know, from the
20	letter we sent, the Panel has some questions that we'd
21	like to ask you. Counsel for either side will also
22	have some questions. We are going to want to start

1	off, we go in and out of public session, but there's
2	a couple of matters that we want to ask you about that
3	has been treated as restricted, not available to the
4	public, so we'd like to ask you about those first and
5	then we might go in public. Otherwise if at any
6	point we're in public and there's something that you'd
7	like to be received only in private session, please
8	let us know.
9	THE WITNESS: Understood.
10	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Judge Gulin has some
11	questions on behalf of the Panel. We're in restricted
12	session.
13	(Whereupon, at 5:50 p.m., the proceedings
14	went into Closed Session.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in

the matter of:

Hearing: Digital Performance Right

in Sound Recording and Ephemeral

Recording,

Docket No. 2000-9 CARP DTRA 1 & 2

Before:

Library of Congress

Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel

Date:

October 22, 2001

Place:

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

HMula